

Norbert P. Lecher, Oxford.
 Donald B. Whitelock, Petersburg.
 Ira E. Stabler, Portland.
 Hugh E. McMahan, Rensselaer.
 Frank W. Conn, Ridgeville.
 Solomon S. Fulford, Wakawa.
 Floyd J. Moffatt, West Baden Springs.

IOWA

Ralph E. Durfey, Aurora.
 Robert S. Hill, Ayrshire.
 Robert W. Lents, Bridgewater.
 Lyle Barthel, Elkader.
 John F. Rechkemmer, Fairbank.
 Emmet P. Kelly, Farley.
 Edwin C. Seltz, Garden Grove.
 Edward O. Koester, Hancock.
 Forrest L. Iverson, Lake Mills.
 Philip J. Durnan, Ossian.
 Carrie R. Newton, Stanzel.
 Edwin A. Hoch, Storm Lake.

KANSAS

Donald E. Ford, Leonardville.
 Verna B. Carter, Sawyer.
 Gilbert E. Drake, Sedgwick.
 Harold L. Beck, Whitewater.

KENTUCKY

Mary A. Copeland, Fern Creek.
 Eugenia C. Lyttle, Manchester.
 Thomas C. Powell, Monticello.

LOUISIANA

Minnie B. Blount, Doynline.

MARYLAND

James A. Grove, Frederick.
 William B. Gibson, Owings.

MISSOURI

Burl B. Nickell, Atlanta.
 Henry C. Gunn, Barnett.
 Clarence M. Shearer, Jr., Esther.
 Leo G. Kidd, Hillsboro.
 Paul E. Fields, Maryville.

NEW JERSEY

Thomas G. Radics, New Brunswick.

NEW YORK

James H. Klingelhoefer, Bethpage.
 Frederick B. Bertrand, Hempstead.

NORTH CAROLINA

Bryon E. Brenton, Candler.
 Alfred W. Huff, Mars Hill.
 Daisy Holthouser, Mocksville.

OREGON

James E. Schuetze, Lafayette.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles Ocepek, Claridge.
 Carroll J. Daly, Greentown.
 Walter W. Gress, Meyersdale.
 Frank P. Hill, Sharon Hill.

RHODE ISLAND

Joseph S. Lahane, Newport.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William D. Hodge, Alcolu.
 William H. Woods, White Hall.
 Beaty Eldridge Reynolds, Sr., Windy Hill Beach.

TENNESSEE

Calvin L. Draffin, Atoka.
 William T. Vaughn, Paris.

TEXAS

Clyde E. Grant, Abilene.
 Travis G. Keeling, Avery.
 Walter R. Fitch, Bedford.
 Willie R. Peacock, Bivins.
 Clifford C. Gilbert, Carbon.
 Ur D. Kindrick, Junction.
 Adolph C. Mestayer, Lone Star.
 James J. Greer, Los Fresnos.
 Rex L. Harris, Marletta.
 Grady W. Henly, New Deal.
 Walter E. Carlson, Phillips.
 Agnes D. Sanford, Pineland.

Roger W. Williams, Poteet.
 Arthur H. Reinhard, Poth.
 Byron Williams, Sulphur Springs.

UTAH

Joseph P. Dillier, Kearns.

WEST VIRGINIA

Edith M. Holmes, Masontown.
 Clyde J. Cornett, Northfork.
 Nell W. Marshall, Pageton.
 Theodore P. Latos, Windsor Heights.

WISCONSIN

Leo F. Mashak, Bangor.
 Arthur L. Peters, Frederic.
 Donald L. Bennett, Glen Haven.
 Emma V. Parish, Linden.
 Howard E. Gaffney, Oxford.
 Milton J. Potratz, Pardeeville.
 Harold G. Hoffman, Sparta.
 Herman J. Gliniski, Stevens Point.
 Michael J. Gonring, West Bend.
 Stephen V. Johnson, Williams Bay.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art willing and able to satisfy our temporal needs and our eternal longings, help us to appreciate more fully how sacred and wonderful it is that daily we may hold communion with a mind of supreme intelligence and a heart whose infinite love will never let us go.

We pray that we may yield ourselves unreservedly to the guidance of Thy spirit, and when the ways are dark and beset with difficulties may we go forth unafraid, placing our hands in Thine and heeding Thy voice when Thou dost say, "This is the way; walk ye therein."

God grant that our faith day by day may be deepened. May we feel that Thou wilt lead us out of darkness into the clear light of day.

May we be supremely confident that all things are working together for our good if we love Thee. Hear us in the name of the Captain of our salvation, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHICAGO INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 330) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago Inter-

national Trade Fair, to be held at Chicago, Ill., from March 22 to April 6, 1952, inclusive, by the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at the said trade fair, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said trade fair to sell within the area of the trade fair any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the trade fair, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said trade fair under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisal, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provision of this act, shall be reimbursed to the extent not covered by customs duties paid on articles imported for exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, by the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 19, sec. 1524).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 21, strike out "provision" and insert "provisions."

Page 3, line 22, strike out all after "reimbursed" down to and including the word "Fair" in line 24.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ADELAIDE JOHNSON

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, 105 years ago today Mrs. Adelaide Johnson was born. She was one of the outstanding sculptors of our country. I am introducing a bill to provide for the national recognition of Adelaide Johnson, the sculptor of the Woman's Monument. I wish to read the bill:

A bill to provide for national recognition of Adelaide Johnson, the sculptor of the Woman's Monument, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the statuary work located in the United States Capitol, known as the Woman's Monument, shall be maintained perpetually in the Capitol in honor of America's womanhood, and the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to cause an appropriate inscription to be placed on the back of the monument.

(b) The Architect of the Capitol is further authorized and directed to cause a marble bust to be made of Adelaide Johnson, who is 105 years of age today, the creator of the monument, who bears the title of "The Sculptor of the Woman's Monument," to be placed on the fourth of background position on the monument. Such bust shall be made in accordance with plans and specification submitted to the Architect of the Capitol and shall be maintained perpetually in the Capitol. All necessary arrangements for the dedication of such statue, and ceremonies connected therewith, shall be made by the Architect of the Capitol in cooperation with interested groups, public or private.

(c) The sum of \$25,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for payment to the said Adelaide Johnson as partial compensation to her for her many years of labor in creating the monument.

The Woman's Monument was originally presented to the Nation in the days of Mrs. Johnson's great affluence but because of Mrs. Johnson's present dire needs and great age it is urgent that Congress grant this special emergency request. It should be further known that Mrs. Johnson spent more than 20 years in creating this monument and it is the only monument in the world made by a woman in behalf of women, dedicated to their emancipation and standing in a Nation's Capitol.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 25 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]
SHIPMENT OF AMERICAN GOODS ABROAD

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some time ago we were advised in the press, this was about 2 or 3 years ago, that the automobile industry had reached the point where the population would not be able longer to buy the new cars the industry was putting out, and it was feared overproduction might injuriously affect our motor industry in Michigan. Some of my colleagues were telling me this morning that the French were insisting if we continued to send relief over there to them we would have to pay them to take it, pay some kind of a tax to them before they would accept it. I was wondering whether or not these other countries that we have been aiding to the extent of billions and billions of dollars over the years have now found it impossible longer to use or to store the resources or whatever you care to call it—the good things that we were sending, including our dollars, and if they would have to establish a Fort Knox where they could bury the gold and store the food that we are sending them. If that is the situation, I think we ought to devote a little attention to the percentage we are to pay them to induce them to accept the munitions of war—the other property we furnish. Twenty percent seems altogether too much. Two and one-half percent ought to be enough, or it may be if we get a Republican administration they will pay us for it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

MARKETING FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 39) to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 39, with Mr. BECKWORTH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday, the Clerk had read section 1 of the bill. If there are no amendments to that section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is found and declared that the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities affects the public welfare and is a matter of grave national concern; that

vast quantities of fruits, vegetables, and other perishable agricultural commodities shipped from various producing areas located throughout the United States and foreign countries pass through and are handled in public marketing facilities located in large consuming areas which are in most instances inadequate and obsolete; that the handling of perishable agricultural commodities in such facilities is attendant with many uneconomic practices, greatly increasing costs and causing undue losses, excessive waste, spoilage, and deterioration, which result in producers receiving prices far below the reasonable value of their products, in unduly and arbitrarily enhancing costs of operations in such markets, and increasing the price of food to consumers; that the prices of all perishable farm commodities are directly affected by the prices made on these public markets and are adversely affected by the unduly burdensome costs resulting from obsolescent and inadequate facilities; that obsolete and antiquated facilities create such an undue restraint and unjust burden on interstate commerce as to make it imperative that appropriate measures be taken to free such commerce from such burdens and restraints and to protect producers and consumers against oppressive costs resulting from the use of such facilities; that modern facilities would make possible the saving of millions of dollars annually by removing the cause of many of the unnecessary costs and burdens; that in spite of the great need for improved facilities, efforts in the past have failed to bring about a satisfactory solution to the problem; that this failure has been due largely to the inability of farmers, dealers, brokers, commission merchants, and others, individually or collectively, to obtain through regular financial channels the relatively large amounts of capital necessary for the construction of modern facilities. In consequence of the conditions referred to above, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress through the powers herein conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture, to aid in the establishing of such public marketing facilities for the wholesale handling of fresh fruits and vegetables, poultry, eggs, dairy products, other perishable agricultural commodities and sea food as will be conducive to orderly and efficient distribution, increased consumption, and a reduction in the spread between prices paid by consumers and those received by farmers.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 3, line 14, after the period insert "It shall be a part of the policy and general purpose that no law or regulation shall be issued to prevent dairy products, which meet the requirements of the United States Public Health Service Code from sale in these marketing facilities or between the States, the District of Columbia, or the Territories."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment for it is not germane. The amendment deals with other acts of Congress, and other programs which are quite alien to the bill now before us. The amendment attempts to circumvent existing law, and to make lawful that which is now unlawful in that such rules and regulations are now in existence and which prevent the sale of milk from outside areas in the District of Columbia were issued pursuant to acts of Congress, heretofore passed. The bill before us does not attempt to amend existing law, and I sub-

mit that the amendment therefore is not germane, and therefore make the point of order against it, and insist upon the point of order for the reasons I have stated.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the amendment is in order because on the first page of the bill reference is made to the marketing of perishable agricultural products affecting the public welfare, and being of grave national concern. Then, on page 2, the bill refers to the handling of perishable agricultural products and says it is attendant with many uneconomic practices, greatly increasing costs, and causing undue losses, excessive waste, spoilage, and deterioration, and that the value of the products is enhanced because of the perishable part of the program.

It also refers to the Interstate Commerce Act in lines 15 and 16 where it states "create such an undue restraint and unjust burden on interstate commerce as to make it imperative that appropriate measures be taken to free such commerce from such burdens and restraints and to protect producers and consumers against oppressive costs resulting from the use of such facilities."

It does not refer to milk, as the chairman said; it refers to dairy products. Certainly dairy products are perishable commodities that are carried in interstate commerce. There has been no law as far as the District of Columbia or Territories are concerned regulating the sale of milk; the sale of milk in the District of Columbia is governed by a regulation issued by the Commissioners which prohibits the sale of milk which complies with the United States Public Health Service grade A requirements, milk which is accepted in 32 States and all of the cities of the country except one area, the District of Columbia; that is the only area where the sale is prohibited. Set up one of these marketing facilities in the District of Columbia and you would not be able to bring in milk that passes in every State in the Union, because of the restrictions set up in the Commissioners' regulation.

I maintain that the amendment is germane to this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard a moment further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. COOLEY. In reply to the gentleman's statement and his reference to the language in lines 15 and 16 on page 2 of the bill, that language does make reference to interstate commerce. There is no attempt in this bill, however, to regulate interstate commerce in any manner, and the gentleman's amendment is a definite direct regulation of interstate commerce, and he seeks by his amendment to make the sale of milk legal in specific facilities here in the District of Columbia. Should the amendment be adopted, this situation would exist: Milk could come in from

some distant State and be sold in this particular facility in the District of Columbia, whereas it would not be acceptable for sale in any other facility in the same District of Columbia.

We say it is an effort to regulate interstate commerce and circumvent existing laws.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question, does the gentleman think that under the bill as it now stands should one of these marketing facilities be established in the District of Columbia, and I hope one will be, that dairy products from other States could be brought in and sold within the District of Columbia?

Mr. COOLEY. If you were drawing a law applicable to all such facilities.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There is no law; it is a regulation.

Mr. COOLEY. But the regulations which the gentleman mentioned are issued by virtue of authority vested in the governing body of the District of Columbia. The gentleman now is asking us here in Congress to invalidate the rules and regulations that are now in existence. I think the purpose of the gentleman's amendment is quite obvious for the reason I have just given, that the gentleman is trying to vitiate a District of Columbia regulation with reference to one particular market, to wit, the marketing facilities which may be established pursuant to the provisions of this act.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the amendment and then I ask to be recognized for 5 minutes under a pro forma amendment to strike out the last word.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I should like to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman had withdrawn the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has asked consent to withdraw the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the Chairman's point of order will be sustained. I do not like to offer amendments unless I think they are germane. I tried to draw the amendment so it would be germane. I think it is only fair that these marketing facilities provided by the Federal Government should accept milk approved by the Public Health Service. The present regulations in the District of Columbia protect the Virginia-Maryland Milk Producers Association. Only their milk can be sold in the District.

Children must have milk. The gentleman referred to milk that comes into the District. It is sterilized by steam. It is just ridiculous that Congress has allowed a monopoly to get a strangle hold on every quart of milk the people of the District of Columbia buy, when in 32 States of the Union and all the large cities of the country except this

city, chemical sterilization is acceptable. Chemical sterilization is an accepted process of handling milk. But such milk products are not allowed to come into the District of Columbia. You ask why; I answer, because they have set up a monopoly, if you please, a tight monopoly that prevents any milk coming into this milkshed unless it has been treated by the steam sterilization process. Yet chemical sterilization is accepted by all the other States.

This requirement of steam sterilization makes milk higher in the District of Columbia than any other place in the United States or at least in the upper one-third level. Why, they drink more beer and liquor in the District of Columbia than milk. The children of the District of Columbia are penalized because of the high cost; many times it is uneconomical to feed milk to them. At Walter Reed Hospital, at St. Elizabeths Hospital, you feed the patients milk that comes in under chemical sterilization, but you cannot do that at the District jail, and you cannot do that at Gallinger Hospital.

I submit to you, and I submit to this committee, that there should be written into this bill some kind of regulation, and it would really apply only to the District of Columbia, that would permit milk which has the stamp of approval of the United States Public Health Service and is labeled "Grade A milk" to have access to the District of Columbia. I think the present situation is most unjust, and I shall certainly search diligently in the future for some bill to which such an amendment can be attached.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I should like to say to the gentleman that I have no desire to encourage or foster monopolies in the District of Columbia or anywhere else; and I do not question the gentleman's sincerity or the object which he seeks to accomplish, but I am wondering if it would not be better to meet the issue head-on and forthrightly by bringing in a bill containing the substance of the gentleman's amendment and let the House decide the very important question which the gentleman is discussing. I am frank to say I would be very much impressed with the gentleman's views on it; however, I do not think we ought to have it in this bill because I do not think the application would be general enough.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows that I appeared before the District committee on the subject of bringing in milk from outside areas under public health requirements. I feel that the gentleman's amendment is germane to this bill but as long as he has withdrawn it, of course, it is not subject to further discussion. I hope that the gentleman will press for action to permit good sanitary milk to come into the District in order to break this monopoly.

It would be a good thing for the consumers of the District and it will be a good thing for the country as a whole.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman. It does seem that the Congress should be interested in breaking this unholy alliance that now penalizes every child who drinks milk in the District of Columbia. The standards for milk sold in Maryland-Virginia and 32 States should be accepted in the District. The citizens are entitled to this good milk.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the bill before us today presents a fundamental question which goes far beyond the narrow issue whether we should authorize Government loans to aid in the construction of warehousing facilities. The more basic question is, How far are we going in these critical times when our defense expenditures are necessarily so staggering and our demands on the taxpayers so heavy, in authorizing the Government to embark upon entirely new ventures, or to go into completely new fields of activity, unrelated to any needs of national defense or security?

We on both sides of the aisle are paying a lot of lip service these days to the principle that in these times when we are compelled to spend so much money to insure our survival as a free nation, we should curtail our nondefense spending at every possible point. But here we are being asked in this bill to authorize an embarkation upon a completely new program, namely, the Federal guaranteeing of loans for the construction of marketing facilities. We should be devoted to the task of devising ways and means of reducing presently authorized spending instead of combing the highways and byways of our national economy to search out new and novel methods, as yet undiscovered, of obligating the taxpayer's dollars.

The amount involved is not tremendous by Washington standards. The authorized appropriation is \$25,000,000. The limit of the authorized Government guaranty is \$100,000,000. In other words, that is as far as the Government could go. But, following the pattern that has become so tragically familiar, a bill will come before us next year or the year after to raise the authorized limitation on borrowing. One hundred million is just a starter. Those dedicated to the philosophy that the Government can do everything better than anyone else will not rest until this fund has been increased to a point where it represents virtual Federal control of this industry.

I also call attention to the provisions on pages 12 and 13 of the bill which I look upon as a joker or a sleeper where it is stated that if there is not sufficient money in the insurance fund to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments to mortgagees as provided, he is not precluded from acting. Oh, no. He may then issue notes to the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain funds to make additional payments. In other words, the possibilities inherent in this

bill are far beyond the \$100,000,000 authorization. Indeed they are virtually limitless.

It is true probably that if the Secretary exceeded the limit, a bill would then be brought before us to authorize the lifting of the \$100,000,000 limit, but the damage would already have been done and we would be faced with an accomplished fact.

Mr. Chairman, precedents can be cited for this type of Government operation. Some were mentioned by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. It is probably fair to say that it is preferable for the Federal Government to guarantee loans by private institutions than it is to make such loans directly. It is a matter of judgment where we are going to draw the line. Sincere, well-meaning men and women will differ. But somewhere, sometime, we must decide where we shall stop.

If loans for the construction of warehousing facilities are to be guaranteed by the Government, then why not loans to build food-processing plants? Why not loans to build textile and other plants to make the clothing for our people? Then why not any manufacturing or marketing activity concerned with the production or distribution of essential commodities? You may say such Government guaranties can be restricted solely to essentials. All right. Then we come to the question, What are luxuries and what are essentials? The luxury of today becomes the essential of tomorrow. Witness, the automobile, the radio, the washing machine, the telephone.

The road down which this bill points the way is to the complete guaranty by Uncle Sam of all banking and other loaning activities. When that road is followed to its logical conclusion it leads inevitably to the nationalization of banking. There are some sincere people who believe it is desirable in the public interest to nationalize our banks. I do not adhere to that philosophy. I never could. I believe it is the first step in a dangerous trend. I believe it spells the doom of the greatness of our Nation and the happiness and prosperity of our people.

I am not one who has opposed all of these lending and guaranteeing activities of the Federal Government. As I look back, I sometimes think, however, that my error has been in going too far rather than in not going far enough. I see a dangerous and growing tendency on the part of people everywhere throughout the land, in the cities and in the rural areas, to ask the Federal Government to solve their problems for them instead of trying by their own energy and initiative and on the local level in their own communities to meet the economic questions which present themselves from time to time in the old-fashioned way that my mother and father taught me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there are activities which are so vast in their scope and character and which involve such large expenditures or commitments that they cannot be adequately handled through private channels. Some of those I have supported. It strikes me that is the yardstick we should employ in reaching a decision whether or not we should go along with a particular bill involving the injection of Government into the field traditionally reserved for private enterprise. There has been no proof offered here satisfactory to satisfy the test that in this instance there is a need for the Government to step in and to guarantee these loans, no proof that unless that is done, it will be impossible for public markets to continue in these municipalities.

True, at the top of page 3 of the bill in the statement of declaration of policy it is asserted that the failure to construct these facilities has been due largely to the inability of farmers, dealers, brokers, commission merchants and others, individually or collectively, to obtain through regular financial channels the relatively large amounts of capital necessary for the construction of modern facilities.

I have not been shown the evidence, however, to support that finding. Conviction on that point is essential to the passage of this bill in my judgment of holding the philosophy of government and its proper function which I do. It seems to me that unless we are to change our entire concepts regarding the proper and legitimate scope of governmental activity, it is necessary that we be shown that those interested in constructing markets cannot obtain the funds to build these facilities through private channels. They have been built, they are being administered all over the country, and this has been going on for many years, without this governmental assistance. The burden of showing the need for change rests squarely on the shoulders of the proponents of this measure. They have not met that burden.

An impressive list of those who support this measure was given to us by the distinguished chairman of this committee. They know of the particular little problem before them. It is the same principle we have encountered time and time again. There was no one speaking before this committee for the vast body of people, the taxpayers and the wage earners of this country, and all the folks that must foot the bill for these additional governmental activities. I want to hear from them before I lend my support to this bill. I do not want to hear from just the little group that might be benefited, whether they be business or labor or agriculture or any other group. I want to hear from the vast segment of the people and find out whether they want us to authorize the Government in these times to embark upon new and

potentially costly ventures. I do not believe they do.

There is another dangerous element in this legislation which time does not permit me adequately to discuss. I see in this measure one more effort to bring another activity, this time the marketing of farm commodities, eventually under the complete control of a central government. I have analyzed this measure and find repeatedly provisions conferring powers upon the Secretary of Agriculture to lay down standards and control the determination as to who shall loan the money, who shall borrow the money, what the terms of the loan shall be, where these markets shall be placed, and so forth. There are no less than 30 places in this bill where specific power or authority is delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture, designed to fasten his hold firmly on this segment of our economy. That should be a warning to us. We are the guardians of the liberties of our people. Let us not fail to fulfill the sacred trust which they have committed to us.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of clarifying from the members of the committee who are handling this legislation the intent of the legislation and the scope of the authority for handling these facilities after they have once been erected.

I would like to preface what I have to say on this legislation with the statement that I have supported, with the exception of the Mexican wetback bill passed recently by the House, every piece of legislation favorable to the farm interests of this country since I became a Member of Congress in 1945, without question. But there are some questions that I want answered, and I think the committee is entitled to some clarification.

For instance, it was my pleasure as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct the hearings on November 12, 1949, into the famous Di Giorgio farms in California. There is some interesting information that I am sure has a direct bearing on this legislation. Let me remind you that this firm at the present time is well on its way to cornering the fruit and vegetable markets of the United States. This firm owns outright the facilities in the city of Baltimore. They control 50.59 percent of the facilities in the city of New York. At times as much as 80 percent of the fruits and vegetables reaching the New York market come from the Di Giorgio farms in California.

Let me read to you the extent of their operations. This is the testimony:

The Di Giorgio Corp. has controlling or minority interests in the following enterprises in addition to this: The Baltimore Fruit Exchange; the New York Fruit Auction; United Fruit Auction, of Pittsburgh; United Fruit Auction, of Cincinnati; Fruit Auction Sales, of Chicago; Klamath Lumber & Box Co.—

And many other affiliates.

What I want the committee to explain to the Members of this House is, Will

this octopus that is bordering on the edge of becoming a monopoly be eligible for loans under this act to build these facilities and tighten its hold on the fruit markets in the major cities of this country? If they are, I do not want any part of it.

Here is a farm that is doing business in excess of \$18,000,000 annually. They handled over 12,000,000 packages of fruit in 1949 and over 600,000 packages of vegetables of various kinds, cartons and crates of vegetables. I just want to know whether we are giving Government assistance here by underwriting a loan to an outstanding corporation that is now fastening its tentacles upon the fruit markets and the vegetable markets of the United States.

I see a gentleman from the State of California is here. I am sure he is going to have something to say about it. Along with the other members of the committee, I think the House needs an explanation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I call attention to the fact that if the gentleman will refer to page 14, line 18, he will find this language:

That the market facility will not be operated in a manner which would discriminate against any perishable agricultural commodity on account of geographical origin of such commodity or prevent any producer, seller, or buyer from utilizing the market facility because of his organization, business methods (if not unfair or unlawful), membership or nonmembership in any organization, or on account of the method of transportation of the products.

It certainly is not contemplated that any loan would be made under this act to accomplish anything such as was described by the gentleman.

Yesterday the gentleman will recall that there was great excitement over the fact that I had referred to a warehouse that had been built between Richmond and Petersburg by the A. & P.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. It was suggested then that I was complaining because of the efficient method in which this corporation was operating its business. That was far from my mind. I was commending the effort of the A. & P., and showing how private corporations and associations had demonstrated more foresight and vision than many of the municipalities in which farm produce is sold. The gentleman, I think, knows it is not our purpose to encourage any monopolistic operation. We are trying here now to let the public markets be in a better position to compete with these efficiently operated markets.

Mr. BAILEY. May I ask the gentleman this direct question? Will they be eligible for a loan—yes or no?

Mr. COOLEY. No; not if they operate the market as a monopoly, as the gentleman described.

Mr. BAILEY. Will there be any regulations by the regulatory authority, which will limit the amount of space they can acquire in one of these facilities?

Mr. COOLEY. That will be entirely in the hands of the operating authority, whether it is a municipality or whether it is a privately organized corporation. All of the plans for the operation of the market first must be submitted and approved by the marketing experts in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

What would prevent any organization from coming under the loan provisions of this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. The language of the bill prevents it. If the gentleman will read the bill, I am sure he would have a better understanding of it.

Mr. BAILEY. I cannot find anything in the bill to convince me that they would not be eligible for a loan.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will look at the language I just referred to on page 14, you will see that the loan will not be insured to any private corporation to operate a closed market. The market must be open to all producers and to all buyers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The provision that the gentleman refers to certainly would not permit the renting of space to people to come in on a monopolistic basis to sell their eggs, meat, and other poultry products, and so on, but the monopolies would run, although the loan, of course, would not be made on a monopolistic basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the people I represent in the Seventeenth Congressional District of Michigan want me to support this legislation. The people of my district have provided their own marketing facilities, and I am sure they would not want me to support legislation which would make them potentially liable some day to pay for market facilities in cities perhaps a thousand miles away from them. This bill provides exactly that. That is one of the objections I have to this bill. The other objection, which is more serious in my opinion and which has been very ably discussed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], is the principle of looking to Washington for every conceivable thing in their normal life. Lincoln once said:

The Government should never do for the people what the people can do for themselves.

It seems to me that when the history of this country is examined, that in this particular field we will find that the people through the years have done for

themselves what the Government might have done for them. The people have never asked that it be done for them. We might as well say to the country, "Why not let the Federal Government guarantee the money or the loan required for the building of police stations, fire-engine houses, textile mills, and merchandising plants?" This bill violates the American principle of local self-government. This is a foot in the door. I do not say the Federal Government may positively be called upon to pay the bill, but suppose it is called upon to pay for a venture which has not proven successful. Then the Government of the United States is in the marketing business. If these risks are not good enough to be taken by local investors, they should not be built. The best judges of that are the people in the local area, whether it is New York, Boston, Philadelphia, or any other city. For that reason, I do not think this is a field into which the Federal Government should inject itself.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to say to the gentleman that the Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture does not make studies in any community except upon the request of the people in a particular community. I have information here to the effect that in Detroit now there is a study of the marketing facilities under way. So, there must be some question as to the adequacy of these facilities in the city of Detroit. I concede that the gentleman has a question in his mind as to the adequacy of available facilities in certain cities now. But the gentleman should know that in forty-odd cities the people are calling upon the Department of Agriculture to make studies of their marketing facilities, and they are making those studies pursuant to legislation which we have already passed and which we are financing.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, that undoubtedly those studies have been influenced and perhaps instigated by a trend in this land to look to the Federal Government for everything.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. DONDERO. Why should these cities expect the Federal Government to provide marketing facilities for them anyway? Why should they not do it themselves?

Mr. COOLEY. I can answer that. The Boston market is perhaps 200 years old, and the New York market is over 100 years old.

Mr. DONDERO. I still have faith in the city of Boston.

Mr. COOLEY. I have lost faith in the people of the city of New York regarding marketing facilities because my committee has studied that problem quite thoroughly and we know they are not going to improve that facility unless they can be induced to build a marketing facility which is easily accessible to trucks and trains.

Mr. DONDERO. If they do not build their own marketing facility, there must be something wrong as far as their ability to manage and make self-sustaining that kind of a facility.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman know, and can he tell the House what it costs to unload a carload of produce in his city?

Mr. DONDERO. I am not aware of or familiar with all of the details. I am aware of this, however, that this bill we would be nationalizing and placing in the central government authority and even financial responsibility in an entirely new field. How long will it be before the Federal Government controls everything?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman apparently does not understand the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. I think I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. There is one more point I wish to stress. I have before me two pages of requests from industrial plants in the Detroit metropolitan area and from other sources, and particularly the mayor and the superintendent of schools of the city of Detroit, and a number of other citizens in my congressional district, all appealing for the allocation of steel to construct schoolhouses, and to continue the operation of industrial plants. If this bill passes and these marketing facilities are to be built, they are going to compete for the very strategic material, steel, needed for these purposes.

I think this bill should be defeated. Marketing facilities should be provided at the local level and not the Federal Government.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have a very high regard for the gentleman, and I think he has some respect for my opinion. I want him to know that I have studied this subject for more than 15 years and that I am very much for this bill. The answer to the gentleman's question as to why the Federal Government does not go into the building of police stations is that that is a community matter which can be settled by the community. But there are factors in this program which go beyond the local community; they involve the railroads and many other elements that are not controllable by a city, and as in the case of New York and Philadelphia the markets are so old that the consumers are the ones who are suffering.

Mr. DONDERO. Let me interrupt the gentleman at that point. Who will be benefited more than the consumers of the particular areas where these mar-

keting facilities are built? Has all local pride died in this land?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, but the gentleman is denying the consumers the help which this bill would give them; there is no money loaned in this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. That is true.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is an insurance provision.

To answer the gentleman's other question—and it is a fair expression by him and others as to scarce material—there is nothing in the bill that takes scarce material; the material would not be available. I believe the gentleman from North Carolina will concur in an amendment that will be offered to satisfy the qualms of those people who think scarce materials might be involved.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to say, since some objection to the bill has been prompted by fears that scarce and critical materials might be utilized in the construction of marketing facilities, I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUMMA] will offer this amendment:

That construction of the marketing facilities will not entail the use of controlled materials in quantities requiring allocation by a Federal agency.

If that were inserted in the bill it would seem to me it should do away with the fears which have been expressed by several Members. As chairman of the committee I would have no objection to the amendment and will so say at the time it is offered, but I cannot accept it on behalf of the committee.

Mr. DONDERO. That is a partial answer to my objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In connection with the gentleman's very apt and well-phrased comments about this bill, centralizing further powers and responsibilities in Washington, I have gone through the bill and find that there are 30 instances in it—and they are marked in my copy of this bill—where additional authority or power is vested in the Secretary of Agriculture.

In my judgment there are those—I exonerate many of our Members, most of our Members, but there are those who are using this measure to do what we have seen done time and time again here, and that is to place the marketing facilities eventually completely under a centralized Federal control in Washington.

Mr. DONDERO. I think that is wrong for this country has operated on a different principle and it has been successful. Why change the system?

Mr. KEATING. That is right.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. There is evidence in the testimony that the Market Street job in New York City alone will cost \$200,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. There is but \$100,000 of guarantees provided in this bill. I shall vote against this bill and hope it will be defeated.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make this motion at this time not only because I think it is a good time to make it, but because I think the bill should be defeated and I desire to answer the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], my very good friend, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The gentleman from North Carolina said—at least I understood him to say—that the Department of Agriculture never made any survey or investigations unless the people of the community wanted it. Then he referred to the city of New York. I would just like to call his attention to this 120-page release that they put out to the different agricultural agencies of the country calling upon the people to get together and give the Department some idea about a family-farm program—so-called.

Three Federal agents in different counties have called my attention to that pamphlet and in substance stated: "We do not want any of it." I think there are other Members on the floor right now who have had the same experience. That was an attempt, all too familiar to us, to give the Department of Agriculture an opportunity to come to Congress and say that the people want that particular program. The people do not want any of it. Yet the Department of Agriculture spent a lot of money trying to induce the people to get together right quick and tell Congress that they wanted something new with reference to this family farm program. In part it was just another somewhat disguised effort to give the country a little of the Brannan plan.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]—and I admire him and have confidence in him—just goes contrary to the views expressed by my colleague so well and so completely, and I refer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], when he said that this is just another attempt to go along with the New Deal program, socialistic as it is, and get the Federal Government interested in some activity which we can carry on in the various States for ourselves. If we are Republicans, if we have any principles at all and intend to go along with them, why do we not do so when bills like this come up? Why do "me too-ers," when they know the fallacy of the program, with one breath condemn socialism, then swallow a big dose of it just because some group thinks it will be of advantage to its members if they can get Federal officials to help them run their own affairs which, in truth and effect, they can do better than can those who are directed from Washington?

The gentlemen talk about the interest of the consumer. May I say to the gentleman from California, if there is any State in the Union where the growers of fruit and vegetables and other agricultural produce are organized it is in the State of California. Look back over the papers for a year, for the last 10 years, and I do not believe you will find 2 years in succession where the growers and the dealers in California have not destroyed hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of crops. Why? Because they did not get the price they wanted. Within the last month I saw pictures of apples. I do not know whether the apples were grown in California, Washington, or Oregon, but somewhere in the Northwest. I saw pictures of bulldozers covering up apples which had already been bought and were ready for shipment. Why? It has long been the practice when the price did not suit them to let the crop hang on the trees until it dropped to the ground, or, after it was packed, in order to maintain the price here in the East, to destroy the crop—sometimes oranges, sometimes something else. That was not because somebody in the East had a monopoly. It was not because there was no warehouse. It was not for that reason that we did not get it. Oh, no. It was because the growers thought they could not ship it at a profit, and I do not criticize them if they cannot ship and sell at a profit for not marketing it. But do not lay the blame for lack of consumers willing to purchase at your price on anyone here in the East or in the Middle West. Do not come in and tell us because you do not wish to build your own warehouses that the rest of us must build a warehouse or a selling facility in every city so that you can get what you want or need for your produce.

On yesterday they were arguing over here—I think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] was arguing, I am sure others were arguing, that these chain stores were building big warehouses to market fruit. Well, they pay for them. They are in the open market, and because of their efforts they bring to the consumer a better article at a less price. I hold no brief for them. My interest is in the little fellow on the street corner, the corner grocery store. But the supermarkets render a service which the people want and are willing to pay for, so why criticize them?

Let me read an editorial from the morning's issue of the Washington Post. I read:

THE FOOD CHAINS

With the National Association of Food Chains holding its eighteenth annual meeting here, it is a good time to reflect on what modern food distribution has done for consumers in this country. Throughout the land, the old-fashioned grocery store has given way to well-lighted, clean, attractive, and systematized food department stores that operate on a surprisingly small mark-up and profit. By means of self service, modern packaging, and easily accessible parking, the business of getting the produce of farm, pasture, and orchard into the homes of millions of consumers has been amazingly simplified. Not the least of the advantages of this modern way is the development of huge super-

markets where the housewife can find almost any food that hungry stomachs may crave.

This modern development is not, however, simply a matter of easing the housewife's shopping task and trimming food-distribution costs. Through its national association the vast system of food-distributing chains is able to dispose of surplus products that formerly were unmanageable. If there is a surplus of sweetpotatoes in Alabama or of tomatoes in Texas, the association alerts the chains and the chains make a special effort to move the surplus food into consumption. In this process the association works with agricultural producers and cooperatives as well as with the chains to the advantage of both.

It cannot be doubted that this highly organized and smoothly functioning system of food distribution has contributed to the high standard of living in the United States. While the chains have found it possible to cooperate in the exchange of information, competition among them remains keen. And they have substantial competition from cooperative groups of independent merchants. Their strength and their appeal to the public come from mass distribution of food with ever-increasing convenience to the public. The genius that has gone into building this system is in many ways comparable to that responsible for present-day mass production, which has given America its industrial strength.

There are many reasons, any one of which should be sufficient to defeat this bill, which have been put forth on the floor. My colleague from Michigan, [Mr. DONDERO], pointed out very clearly that the passage of this bill was but the wedge which would open the crack through which would follow an innumerable number of similar plans putting the Federal Government into all sorts of business.

That subject might be enlarged on indefinitely.

Several have also argued, and the argument is sound, that it is unfair, when there is so great a shortage of steel, when school districts and hospitals are seeking steel—sometimes to complete construction of public buildings which are under way, sometimes to erect new buildings which are needed—to use tons of steel in the construction of facilities which are not at this time needed.

The bill, if enacted, will be destructive of the rights of the States, it will bring the Federal Government—using the taxpayers' money—into direct competition with taxpayers upon whose payments this Government depends for its very existence. Time does not permit further argument, but many of my colleagues have clearly pointed out the unsoundness of this type of legislation, and, unless we are to embrace socialistic principles, we should either recommit or kill the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan referred to my remarks of yesterday and again today. I had reference, I think most of you know, to the investigation of marketing facilities in different cities in which investigations were made at the request of interested

citizens in those communities where the investigations were conducted. I did not say anything about the PMA family farm program. That is absolutely alien to the bill we have before us. And it is a rather strange sort of scene when a Member of Congress takes the position that has been taken here; that the entire work of a hard-working legislative committee, extending over many years and during both administrations, should be sabotaged on the floor of the House by a man who knows nothing about what he is talking.

This committee operated under the leadership of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] during the time that the Republican Party was in power and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] received the cooperation of the Democrats on this committee. When I took over the chairmanship I had the cooperation of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and other diligent and faithful Republicans of this committee.

This House by unanimous vote authorized my committee to do something about this deplorable situation. We have sent subcommittees to Chicago, New York, New Orleans, and all over the country to study the problem. The gentleman who speaks about it talks as if something new is being started. Why, this started with the Federal Trade Commission in 1917. Investigation after investigation has been made and thousands of dollars have been spent. Certainly we are not trying to embark upon some new and novel program to waste the Federal taxpayers' money. To hear the author of this motion, you would think there is something partisan about this, that the Democratic Party is trying to do something new. I have stated on this floor time and again that my interest in this problem started in 1945 when I spent long hours of the night on the Washington Street Market in New York City. There are Members of this House who had an opportunity to make the same observations that we made but who refused to learn anything about this problem.

Now, they simply say that we are going into something new, that we are going to guarantee some more loans. I wonder if these gentlemen who are opposing the building of these markets by the use of guaranteed loans voted against the Federal housing bill in which we authorized the slum clearance of the cities? We have authorized slum clearance on the farms. Now we are trying to authorize a little slum clearance in the market place. When you realize that it costs \$9 to efficiently unload a carload of produce and when you realize that it costs \$115 to unload it in an inefficiently operated market, such as the Washington Street Market in New York or Dock Street in Philadelphia, that is a penalty or tax that the consumers of this Nation are paying on every carload of farm produce. It is just a question of whether you want to take this chance of authorizing these loans. You say that the money should be available from local sources. Do you think the city of Richmond would not go on and build the market if it was able to do so? Do you

think the city of Boston would not do something about it?

I tell you that the opposition is coming from the vested interests who own and control these deplorable ratholes in which the consumers and the producers of this Nation are forced to transact their business.

I submit that this is a good bill. It ought not to be sabotaged. Imagine what a ridiculous position this House is in when it on one occasion, about 12 months ago, voted unanimously for this bill and now it turns out that it is something horrible, something obnoxious. Why did it become so obnoxious just yesterday? You gentlemen have had an opportunity to come before our committee and express your views. Why have you not done so? We had open and extended hearings. Forty-three witnesses came from all parts of this country clamoring for this legislation. Eighty-seven statements were submitted in support of this legislation. I challenge you to find over a dozen men in this whole record who have opposed the building of these markets. Certainly, most of them who have opposed this legislation have an interest in property now being used in some of the markets which should be improved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NICHOLSON), there were—ayes 39, noes 40.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum. So the motion was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, H. R. 39.

First let me state that I am always suspicious of a bill when its proponents spend a great deal of their time attacking the motives of those who are opposing them. Certainly one can be opposed to this bill on the very simple grounds that he is against the idea of seeking solution to all the inadequacies existing in the country by running to the Federal Treasury. He can oppose the bill because he believes in local self-government and private initiative.

Personally, I have not the slightest idea of what pressure groups are for and against the bill. Frankly, I do not care. I am satisfied that certain of our citizens are directly concerned with the passage or defeat of this bill. If they know their business, they have probably made their views known to the more powerful Members of this body. I hope they have and I praise rather than condemn them if they have. As a freshman Congressman and a member of the minority party

to boot, no one has troubled to solicit my support or even my vote for or against the bill.

I am getting pretty sick and tired of the debates in the House which impugn the motives of either the Members who argue for or against a bill or the group of citizens who either support or oppose a bill. Let us stick to the bill itself. Let us, for heaven's sake, take as admitted the integrity of our colleagues and their deep loyalty to their country. Let us extend this same presumption to our fellow citizens.

Now this does not mean that the heat of debate about what a bill accomplishes should be diminished. But the arguments should revolve about the bill, not the people proposing or opposing it.

The committee chairman has stated that this bill has received extensive study. This may be so but there is little evidence of such a study up to the present. A Member of the House not on the committee can only judge the committee's work on three bases:

First. The committee's report and the committee's hearings.

Second. The adequacy and competency of the staff available to the committee.

Third. The knowledge exhibited by the committee members upon debate of the bill on the floor of the House.

In the particular instance of this bill it must be stated, first, the committee of the Eighty-second Congress has held no hearings whatsoever and this is the Eighty-second Congress, gentlemen, not the Eighty-first. The committee of the Eighty-first Congress held hearings which covered a total of 16 hours. Having read the hearings, I cannot conclude that they were comprehensive. One member of the committee stated that field trips were made, at an unidentified time, to various cities. There seems to be no written report of these trips available to the Members of the House so we gain little benefit here.

Second. Nothing has been said about the staff work on this bill and there seems to be little evidence of staff work having been done.

Third. As stated before, the chairman devoted most of this time not discussing the bill but castigating its opponents. This leaves me, as I have said, unimpressed with the amount of study devoted to the bill.

The bill is a typical example of encouraging the Federal Government to go into the field of private enterprise. The argument is the usual one:

First. Private enterprise has fallen down on the job.

Second. The job must be done.

Third. Government should do it.

The argument is just as fallacious as it has been on Federal housing, Federal power, Federal education, or Federal anything else.

First. Although private enterprise may have fallen down on its job, it does not necessarily follow that private enterprise cannot do the job with a little prodding.

Second. Although the job must be done is not proof that the Federal Government can do the job.

Third. Nor does it follow that even granting the corollaries which we have just denied, that the Federal Government should do it.

I suggest that those of us who believe in the private-enterprise system, and I believe in it as the only safe and sure way to accomplish results, that when we find a situation where there is a need, and private enterprise is not adequately filling that need, we sit down and figure out how we can accomplish the end through private enterprise.

Granted we need better marketing facilities. We need better things in every phase of human endeavor, let us never get so complacent that we do not recognize this. The first question I want to know, are the inadequate facilities which the chairman has suggested are a health hazard, the result of inadequate or unenforced State and municipal laws? Does he know or does the committee know? If the committee has studied this, where are the results of this study?

I suggest that probably a stricter enforcement of local municipal laws is the proper way to force private enterprise to build adequate marketing facilities. Certainly if you permit private enterprise to get by with inadequate facilities from a health and building standard standpoint they will try to get by with them. If the situation is this way, let a congressional committee investigate and report. The publicity resulting from a report of such a shocking condition, if in truth such a condition does exist, will go a long way to solve the problem. But this committee apparently has not even thought of such a study, let alone made it.

Or is the problem that under the banking laws banks cannot make such long-term loans? I do not believe this is the trouble because other communities than those mentioned in the report seem to be able to solve their problems without help from the Federal Government. But if it is, then let us take a look at our banking laws. These are safe loans, the committee chairman tells us, and the Federal Government is running no risk, then let us stop keeping our banks out of good banking business through poor banking laws. But the committee has made no study of this question.

At this point, I wish to interpolate the thinking of some fine Fabian socialists. They state that the first attack on private enterprise should be through an attack on private capital. Keep it away from the field of private enterprise under attack, then private enterprise will default on the job, then we can call attention to this, then we can say, well, it must be done, so alas, government will have to move in. Then when government moves in and messes up the job you call attention to the private enterprise still in the picture and suggest that private enterprise even with government help is not doing the job and that, alas, Government will have to take over more and more. Finally, of course, government completely takes over. This is not just a dreamy blueprint, unfortunately.

But to get on. Perhaps it is incentive that prevents private enterprise from moving in to build and set up more marketing facilities. If the committee's

study had revealed this to be a fact, then I would suggest that a favorable tax provision be written which would add to the incentive of private enterprise to do the job. This has proved most successful in the gas and oil field and conversely the failure to do it in the mining field has had noticeable results the other way.

There are many ways of encouraging private enterprise but you only look for these ways if you are truly interested in preserving a free-enterprise system. And it requires more work, more time and effort, more study, more patience and more faith in the integrity of your fellow citizens. It is so much easier to avoid this work, so much easier to believe your fellow citizen is motivated solely by the desire to make money—that he is special or vested interest. Yes, it is so much easier to prepare a bill and let the Federal Government do it. Let the cost come out of the Federal Treasury.

My own opinion is that it is time for this Congress to go to work. And if this committee believes a problem exists in the marketing facilities around the country, let them go back and really study this problem and see if they cannot solve it through the system of private enterprise. I am certain the people of St. Louis for whom the committee seems so solicitous in this matter, will be happy if they do this.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly obvious that the gentleman who has just addressed the House does not approve of many things that Congress has done. I assume that he does not approve of the rural-electricity program; that he does not approve of the slum-clearance program which has been provided for our cities and the slum-clearance program for the country either and many other programs.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I decline to yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman has used my name.

Mr. COOLEY. I have not used the gentleman's name, and I do not yield.

By the same argument all of us should be opposed to the insurance of individual bank deposits. There are many things that Congress has done which are apparently objectionable to the gentleman who has just addressed the House.

I am not conscious of having castigated anybody; I have tried to present the facts. I believe every Member of this House who has listened to the debate certainly knows something about the bill that is now being considered. It is suggested that our committee has given only superficial consideration to the question with which we are dealing. I think any fair appraisal of the record and the transcript of the evidence will show clearly that the committee has worked long and intelligently and diligently on the matter before us.

This is not a new theory; it is not a new idea; it is something that we have tried for several years to accomplish in the interest of both consumers and the producers. If you will read the hear-

ings you will observe that the bill is supported by the farm organizations, that it is supported by consumer groups, and by others affected by the marketing of agricultural commodities. I think that when the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is offered and accepted, we will know that the bill certainly does not contemplate the use of critical materials in short supply to the injury of the defense effort.

I hope that we will move forward with the debate, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I am opposed to the passage of H. R. 39, the farm marketing facilities finance bill. This is socialistic legislation providing further Government encroachment on private enterprise. It will take away from the defense program materials, manpower, and financing. We do not want our boys in Korea praying over there while we are not passing the ammunition.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I know there is not a single individual in my district who is interested in this bill directly or indirectly, or who will benefit from it in any way. We do not produce fresh fruits or vegetables commercially, and there are no large cities, and no large markets in my district. But I believe anyone who has given consideration to the question of agricultural marketing in this country must reach the same conclusion I have, and that is that the weakest spot in the marketing of agricultural commodities in this country is our method of marketing fresh fruits and vegetables. I think we have a pretty good system for marketing grain, one that has been worked out through years of experience and one that operates effectively. I think our system of marketing livestock operates reasonably well for both producer and consumer. But in the marketing of perishable commodities like fruits and vegetables, I think everyone must admit that the markets do not function effectively, especially in our large cities. This fact is so obvious that as far back as the Seventy-ninth Congress the Committee on Agriculture secured permission to sit as an investigating committee for the purpose of making a study of the marketing of fresh fruits and vegetables in this country. The committee has made a continuous study of the subject since that time. Those who charge that this subject has not had the attention of the Committee on Agriculture must be unaware of the work that has been done in the Seventy-ninth Congress, in the Eightieth Congress, in the Eighty-first Congress, and now in the Eighty-second Congress. During this period the committee has given rather exhaustive study to this question not only by holding hearings in Washington but by studies in the field. The committee has gone over the country investigating markets in many cities; we have gotten up at 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning, gone out, and seen the produce come in; we have seen buyers

operate, and we know what the situation is.

Perhaps we have not found the right remedy, but it has been the opinion not only of the members of the committee who have studied the matter, but also of all with whom we have conferred, including many marketing experts, that the archaic facilities that exist in many of the large cities of this country have prevented the effective marketing of perishable commodities, and it is only through the construction of central markets accessible to railroads and loading facilities and with ample space that we can meet this situation.

This measure is today being opposed by many whom I would expect to support it. I speak particularly of members from large cities whose constituents are today complaining about the high prices they are paying for agricultural commodities, particularly the perishable commodities, and who are paying those prices unnecessarily because of the high cost of carrying on the markets of those cities.

You will not find any great popular demand for this legislation because the people who will benefit by it are not aware of the situation. They are living under a system that has been in existence for years and they do not realize just what the trouble is. Also many of the cities affected most adversely by this situation there, are vested interests that are opposed to the legislation and are fighting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. That is opposition that is difficult to meet. There are labor organizations opposed to these changes because it will mean less unnecessary hauling by the teamsters union, for instance. There are landlords who are opposed to the legislation because they will lose the opportunity to rent the miserable quarters which are being used for market purposes. There are railroads affected by the construction of new facilities that are opposed to it. There are existing warehouses that are opposed to this legislation. This opposition is inevitable as I see it.

The big question that confronted the committee in dealing with this situation was how can a matter of this kind be financed? We did not want Government loans or financing in a situation of this kind. So we adopted a method that has been approved by this Congress on many occasions in connection with the housing problem. We have voted to insure billions in housing loans and I dare say that everyone who has spoken against this form of financing today, has supported the guarantee of housing loans. It is not a new principle that we are invoking. It is an old principle that has been tested and tried and one I believe will work in solving this problem. If there are those who think

there is a better way to do it, I welcome their suggestions, but until we have something better I think we should proceed with this legislation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I concur in everything that has been said by my colleague from Kansas. The Committee on Agriculture has devoted weeks, months, and years of time in an effort to solve this problem. The weak spot is in the merchandising of perishable commodities from producer to consumer. In fact, our committee has devoted more time to this important subject than the Department of Agriculture itself has with the fifty or sixty million dollars a year we have appropriated for research. I inquired of the Research Section of the Department of Agriculture, which receives these large appropriations, as to what they had done about the merchandising of farm products and you will find without exception that they have not gone into the merchandising of agricultural products in any detail.

I am opposing this measure principally on account of the timing of it. We are told that we must make sacrifices in this country, and the people generally, because we are in a desperate situation, we are in a war that we must win. So I figure that we here in the Congress should set the leadership in cutting down appropriations and obligations on the part of the Federal Government rather than to encourage greater commitments on the part for the Federal Government to assume when we are going through this tremendous war expenditure. I am not opposed to this legislation in principle, but I think it is wrong to come here and ask the Congress to pass a measure of this kind, to have additional commitments that our Government will assume as the result of the passage of this bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does not the gentleman think the amendment that will be offered in the matter of allocating steel and other critical materials will have the effect in reality of postponing the operation of this bill, which takes away the objections the gentleman is making?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the purpose of the amendment is to postpone operation of the bill, then we had better leave consideration of the bill to the time when the emergency is over, because we are told this emergency may last for 10 years; some predict it will last for 30 years. At the present time we are called upon to provide steel and other critical materials to England and other countries so that they may carry on their domestic production.

Let me say that not a single proponent of this legislation up to the present time has mentioned the timing in bringing this legislation up for consideration in the House—not one single Member. That is my objection to the bill. I fully recognize that we must improve the marketing facilities for the perishable items, but legislative action should not be taken until the emergency is past. Incidentally

my district produces mostly perishable items, including dairy products, fruits and particularly vegetables, and we want markets in these larger cities to take care of the handling of our particular kind of products. So that I favor the bill in principle, but I want it to work.

The argument is used that if we enact this legislation, if we guarantee these loans to build up these big markets in New York, in Philadelphia, in Richmond, in West Virginia, and in about 40 other places, we are going to reduce the cost of living to the people, that they will be able to buy cheaper food. These buildings they are going to build need steel. They could not put them up otherwise, because they are buildings with terminal facilities that run from 1,000 to 3,000 feet long. They must have the steel. But the building costs are so terrific now that the tenants of these stalls and these spaces in the buildings will have to pay two or three times as much rent if they are going to break even and meet the guaranteed commitments on the loan, so they will have to raise the prices of their fruits and vegetables to the consumer. The consumer will pay more in the long run.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman from Minnesota knows as well as I do that the large cost on which there might be a saving to the consumer is not the rent to the wholesaler but loss due to the handling of the goods, which is very bad in an old market and very good in a new market.

May I ask the gentleman this question: There is the element of investigation, the element of getting together all the elements that are involved in the market, the location of it, the securing of the ground, so they could go on even though scarce materials may not be available.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is true, but they have to buy the ground in these suitable areas where there are railroad and other terminal facilities and the cost of that is terrifically high at the present time. So that added to the cost of the buildings, the cost of which will be guaranteed by the Federal Government, means that the rents will be terrific. I predict utter failure of the entire project if it is enacted and goes into operation at this time. The Government will be owning the buildings and the Secretary of Agriculture will be operating the markets unless he is willing to have the Government stand the loss, so somebody else will take them over and they will be sold at a much cheaper price. Maybe somebody contemplates that.

As far as the people on Washington Street and other streets having objected to moving into new buildings is concerned, I agree with you that they do have objection. They do not want to move out of their present quarters. I am not so sure you are going to get these wholesalers who occupy these areas in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and other places, to move into

the new terminal facilities. The State or city authorities would have to condemn the property in New York and drive them out. They seem to want to do business in the congested area. Then they would have to go out and get new tenants. Maybe that is what the gentleman from Massachusetts would like to do in the liquidation, as he termed it, the putting out of business of the middleman. This is certainly not a bill to knock out the middleman. But there are those local problems that we must consider in passing on legislation of this kind.

Let me urge you to listen from here on to see whether the proponents of the bill speak about the timing in bringing this legislation up for consideration in the House. This is no time to do it. If we have a war to win, if we have a defense program to protect our country, that should come first, and this and other new war measures should be delayed until after the emergency. This is no time for Congress to commit the Federal Government to an additional \$100,000,000 in liabilities. H. R. 39 should be returned to the Committee on Agriculture for consideration at a later date.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

GENERAL PURPOSE

Sec. 3. It is the purpose of this act to facilitate, encourage, and assist municipalities and political subdivisions of States, public agencies, and instrumentalities of one or more States or municipalities, public corporations and boards, and private enterprise in the creation and development of modern and efficient public wholesale markets for the handling of perishable agricultural commodities in areas where such markets are found to be needed and where Federal assistance is requested and authorized as prescribed in this act, to the end that unnecessary costs and burdens attendant with the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities caused by inadequate or obsolete facilities may be eliminated and that the spread between the amount received by producers and the amount paid by consumers may be reduced.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 4. For the purposes of this act—

(a) "Market facility" means all the facilities used in connection with the operation of a public wholesale market, including the land, buildings, fixtures, equipment, and other appurtenances necessary or incidental to the operation of a public wholesale market for perishable agricultural commodities constituting a single integrated market located in a substantially contiguous area, not including public cold-storage warehouses of more than 10,000 cubic feet capacity, or facilities for handling livestock.

(b) "Public wholesale market" means a place which serves as the major source of supply of perishable agricultural commodities consumed in a large consuming area and which is operated primarily for the purpose of selling or otherwise disposing of perish-

able agricultural commodities at wholesale for resale to others.

(c) "Perishable agricultural commodities" means agricultural commodities and products thereof, consisting principally of fresh fruits and vegetables, handled alone or in combination with poultry, eggs, meats, seafood, and dairy products.

(d) "Mortgage" means a first mortgage on real estate, in fee simple or on a leasehold under a lease for not less than 99 years; and the term "first mortgage" means such classes of first liens as are commonly given to secure advances on, or the unpaid purchase price of, real estate under the laws of the State in which the real estate is located, together with the credit instruments, if any, secured thereby.

(e) "Mortgagee" means the original lender under a mortgage, and his successors and assigns approved by the Secretary.

(f) "Mortgagor" means the original borrower under a mortgage and his successors and assigns approved by the Secretary.

(g) "Maturity date" means the date on which the mortgage or loan indebtedness would be extinguished if paid in accordance with periodic payments provided for in the mortgage or credit instrument.

(h) "United States" includes the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(i) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(j) "Eligible borrower" means any municipality or political subdivision of a State, public agency, or instrumentality of one or more States or municipalities, public corporation or board, or private corporation engaging in, or which will engage in, the operation of a public wholesale market facility which meets the eligibility requirements of this act.

MARKET RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Sec. 5. In order to effectuate the objectives of this act and assist in the development of proper, adequate, and efficient marketing facilities in the United States, the Secretary under the authority of, and with funds made available pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, shall undertake, and disseminate the results of, research relating to design, plans, location, methods of operation, materials, use, equipment, and other similar research and analysis, consistent with the needs for the improvement and development of proper, adequate, and efficient marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities.

REVOLVING FUND

Sec. 6. (a) There is hereby created a fund to be known as "the marketing facility mortgage insurance fund" (referred to in this act as the "insurance fund"), which shall be used by the Secretary to make insurance payments under section 9 of this act and to meet the expenses incurred in connection with the acquisition, operation, and disposal of market facilities acquired pursuant to the provisions of the insurance contracts in the event of default by the borrower, except that no part of such fund shall be used for administrative expenses incurred in carrying out this act. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$25,000,000 to constitute such fund which sum shall remain available until expended.

(b) The money in the fund created under this section not needed for current operations shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in direct obligations of the United States or obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

(c) The Secretary shall make an annual report which shall include a complete statement with respect to the status of the insurance fund.

INSURANCE LIMIT

Sec. 7. The amount of any insurance contract which may be made under this act shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 85 percent of the total cost of the market facility as determined by the Secretary: *Provided*, That in no case shall the borrower invest less than \$45,000 of the total cost: *And provided further*, That the investment by the borrower shall always be a claim subordinate to the claim of the United States arising out of an insurance contract under the authority of this act.

INSURANCE OF MORTGAGES

Sec. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized, upon application of a prospective mortgagor or mortgagee under a first mortgage eligible for insurance under this act on a market facility, to insure such mortgage and to make commitments for the insurance of any such mortgage prior to the date of its execution.

(b) The aggregate amount of principal obligations outstanding at any one time on all mortgages insured under this act, and on all mortgages with respect to which commitments to insure have been made, shall not exceed \$100,000,000.

(c) In order for mortgage on a market facility to be eligible under this act—

(1) the person obligated to pay thereunder shall be an eligible borrower;

(2) the market facility mortgage shall be one which is determined by the Secretary to be eligible for mortgage insurance;

(3) the mortgage shall be made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Secretary as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

(4) the principal obligation (and fees and other charges chargeable under subsection (d) of this section) shall be in such amounts not in excess of the amounts specified in section 7 of this act as may be necessary to enable the borrower to establish the market facility;

(5) the mortgage shall have a maturity satisfactory to the Secretary but not to exceed 40 years from the date the mortgage is insured;

(6) the mortgage shall bear interest at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any one time; and

(7) the mortgage instruments shall—

(A) provide for the repayment of the principal obligation, together with interest thereon, in installments in accordance with amortization schedules prescribed by the Secretary; and

(B) contain such provisions with respect to insurance, repairs, alterations, payment of taxes, default reserves, delinquency charges, foreclosure proceedings, anticipation of maturity, additional and secondary liens, and other matters as the Secretary may prescribe.

(d) The Secretary shall require the payment by the mortgagor or mortgagee of such initial fees for inspection, appraisal, and other similar charges as he finds necessary and such amounts may be included in the principal obligation of the mortgage. The proceeds of such fees and charges shall be deposited in the insurance fund (created by section 6 (a)).

(e) For insurance granted pursuant to this act the Secretary shall collect from the mortgagee, upon insurance of the mortgage, an initial charge of one-half of 1 percent of the principal obligation of the mortgage and annually thereafter a charge of one-half of 1 percent of the principal obligation remaining unpaid at the time the charge becomes due, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments. The proceeds of such charges shall be deposited in the insurance fund.

(f) Any contract of insurance executed by the Secretary under this section shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the mortgage for insurance, and the validity of any contract of insurance so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an approved mortgagee from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation of which such mortgagee has actual knowledge.

(g) The mortgagee may, with the approval of the Secretary, assign any mortgage insured under this act, together with the accompanying note and contract of insurance, and the assignee thereof shall thereupon become entitled to all the benefits of such contract of insurance.

PAYMENT OF INSURANCE

SEC. 9. (a) If the mortgagor under a mortgage insured under section 8 is in default for more than 12 months and the mortgagee, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, (1) forecloses, or with the Secretary's consent otherwise acquires the property from the mortgagor after default, (2) conveys title and gives possession of the property to the Secretary, and (3) assigns all his claims against the mortgagor or others arising out of the mortgage transaction or foreclosure proceedings (except claims released with the Secretary's consent) to the Secretary, the Secretary shall pay to the mortgagee, in cash, the value of the mortgage. The Secretary shall make such payments within 1 year after the date the mortgagee makes the conveyance required in the first sentence or the date he makes the assignments required in the first sentence, whichever is the later date.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the value of the mortgage shall be determined, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary by adding to the amount of the original principal obligation of the mortgage which was unpaid on the date of the default, the amount of all unpaid interest; the amount of all payments which have been made by the mortgagee for taxes, special assessments, water rates, and other payments in discharge of liens which are prior to the mortgage, and insurance on the property mortgaged; and a reasonable amount for necessary expenses incurred by the mortgagee in acquiring title to the property and conveying it to the Secretary; and by deducting from such total amount any amount received on account of the mortgage indebtedness after such default.

(c) If there should not be sufficient money in the insurance fund to enable the Secretary to make payments to mortgagees as provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary may make and issue notes to the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain funds to make such payments. Such notes shall be signed by the Secretary or by his duly authorized representatives and shall be negotiable. Such notes shall bear interest, payable semiannually, at a rate equal to the average rate of interest, computed to the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of issue, borne by all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt, and shall have such maturities as the Secretary may determine with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

(d) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section and any renewals thereof and for such purchases may use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are hereby extended to include any such purchases. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary

of the Treasury of such notes shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States.

(e) In any case in which the mortgagor violates any covenant or condition of his mortgage, the Secretary may require the mortgagee to assign such mortgage, together with the incidents thereto, upon payment of the value of the mortgage determined in accordance with this section.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 10. To be eligible for the benefits of this act, a borrower must show to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the facility is needed and that the location, design, method of financing, method of operation, and such other requirements as the Secretary may determine necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, will be met, including the following:

(a) That the market facility will reduce the cost of distribution of perishable agricultural commodities; and handle a sufficient volume of business to enable the loan to be amortized within the period specified at the time the loan is made.

(b) That the market will be so located and designed as to make possible the direct loading and unloading of rail and truck receipts into or from the buildings of handlers receiving substantial quantities of perishable agricultural commodities by such methods of transportation, and that no restrictions will be imposed which will prevent access to the facility of supplies handled by any rail or truck transportation company.

(c) That sufficient land is included as a part of the facility to meet the needs of the initial construction, plus a reasonable amount of land for expansion of the market facility, and in no case shall the land available for future expansion be less than one-fourth of the acreage utilized in the initial construction.

(d) That not more than one-third of the total cost of the market facility, including the land set aside for future expansion, is to be expended for the acquisition of land, graded and placed in condition for construction.

(e) That the market facility will not be operated in a manner which would discriminate against any perishable agricultural commodity on account of geographical origin of such commodity or prevent any producer, seller, or buyer from utilizing the market facility because of his organization, business methods (if not unfair or unlawful), membership or nonmembership in any organization, or on account of the method of transportation of the products.

(f) That the rentals and other charges for the use of the market facility will be established at reasonable levels approved by the Secretary and designed to meet the obligations, defray the costs of maintaining and operating the market facility, and provide reasonable reserves.

(g) That any substantial alterations of the market facility will be made only with the approval of the Secretary.

(h) That reports will be made to the Secretary at such intervals and giving such information concerning the market facility as the Secretary may require, and that the books and records of the market facility will be available for examination by the Secretary at its offices at any time during business hours.

(i) That the title to the market facility, or any part thereof, will not be transferred or encumbered, or leased for any purpose not related to the operation of the market, and that any of the vacant land of the market facility will not be leased for a period longer than 1 year (including the period of any renewals or extensions of such lease), except with the approval of the Secretary.

MAXIMUM CHARGES

SEC. 11. If mortgage insurance is extended by the Secretary under this act, to aid in financing the construction of a market facility, the maximum charges which may be received for the use of the market facility shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary during the period between the date the assistance is extended and the maturity date originally specified in the mortgage instruments. The Secretary shall approve such maximum charges if he determines they are reasonable and nondiscriminatory.

DEFAULT

SEC. 12. Whoever knowingly demands or receives a charge in excess of the applicable maximum charges approved under section 11 or violates any covenant or condition arising out of a mortgage insurance contract, other than a default in payment, shall be liable to a penalty of not more than \$2,000 for each such offense. Each distinct violation shall be a separate offense, and in the case of a continuing violation each day shall be deemed a separate offense. Such penalty shall accrue to the United States and may be recovered in a civil action brought by the United States.

ACQUISITION, OPERATION, AND DISPOSAL

SEC. 13. In the event of default, and conveyance of the property to the Secretary under the applicable provisions of this act, the Secretary is authorized to accept title to such property; to maintain and operate (but not including engaging in the business of buying or selling perishable agricultural commodities) or lease such property for such period as may be necessary to protect the interest of the United States therein and to sell or otherwise dispose of such property at public or private sale to the highest responsible bidder on such terms and on such conditions as the Secretary deems feasible. All net amounts realized from the operation or disposal of any property acquired under this section shall be deposited in the insurance fund. The insurance fund shall be available to defray expenditures in connection with the acquisition, maintenance, operation, and disposal of any such properties without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

FEES AND COMMISSIONS

SEC. 14. No officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture shall directly or indirectly be the beneficiary of or receive any fee, commission, gift, or other consideration for, or in connection with, any transaction or business under this act other than such salary, fee, or other compensation as he may receive as such officer or employee. Any person violating any provision of this section shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than \$2,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 15. (a) The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

(b) The Secretary shall administer this act by agencies within the Department of Agriculture presently engaged in investigating and developing plans for improved market facilities.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 16. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this act, except that any expenses in connection with marketing facility research, development of plans for market facilities, determination of the need for market facilities, and methods of operation of market facilities shall be financed from funds

made available pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 and the marketing farm products item in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, many hearts are bleeding here today for the consumers of the United States. Some of those same hearts did not bleed so much when we had price-control legislation before this body.

I note that the report of the committee on the bill states that consumer representatives in all parts of the United States are practically unanimous for the bill. That was stressed by the chairman and other members of the committee in their presentation. I have been reading the hearings on this bill, and I do not find this abundance of testimony on the part of the consumer representatives. I rise to ask if the chairman of the committee or some member of the committee will pinpoint for me the pages on which I can read the testimony given by consumer representatives in behalf of this measure. Can anybody tell me where I can find this testimony? I am interested in behalf of the consumers of the United States, and I would like to read what their representatives say in behalf of this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I regret that I cannot give the gentleman the information he seeks, but I might say this, and I am speaking in opposition to the bill at the present time: The long-range objective is that if these terminal facilities are established the consumers will eventually get cheaper perishable items.

Mr. CANFIELD. I understand that, and there is testimony in the hearings to that effect, but I find this testimony on the part of the secretary of agriculture of the State of New Jersey, that the bill insofar as the amount involved is concerned, is unrealistic, that is, the guarantee of mortgages at \$100,000,000, because, he says, the Washington Street Market in New York City alone will cost a couple of hundred million dollars.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I direct the gentleman's attention to page 240 of the hearings before the committee in the Eighty-first Congress. There are several pages of statements of testimony concerning the matter the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman just tell me how many consumer representatives were heard by the committee? Four? Five? Six?

Mr. COOLEY. I have not counted the consumers representatives. There must be dozens of them. Commissioners of agriculture from the different sections of the country came in behalf of the bill, and representatives of chambers of commerce. You have the commission-

ers of markets of many of the States and cities testifying. If the gentleman will just look from page 240 through to the end of the hearings, he will find the evidence that should be considered by him.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUMMA: Page 15, after line 21, add the following new paragraph:

"(J) That construction of the marketing facility will not entail the use of controlled materials in quantities requiring allocation by an authorized Federal agency."

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, statements have been made that these buildings will not require critical materials. I thoroughly disagree with those statements because it will require a lot of steel. A great deal of cement is going to be used in them. But cement and steel sort of compliment each other. Steel takes a pull and cement takes a push. It cannot be done structurally without using critical material. I believe all my colleagues are receiving letters every day talking about the impossibility of procuring steel for schools and other similar emergency purposes. I think this amendment will straighten out that problem because it will be impossible to do this work until the required materials come in fuller supply. I saw a statement put out by the Committee on Education last week showing that for the fourth quarter of 1950 there have been some 2,200 applications for school buildings denied. This situation is cumulative, and I, for one, do think that the schools should have preference.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman. I hope it will be adopted, because it is not contemplated by the sponsors of this legislation that steel should be taken from more critical uses and put into the building of these markets.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. I think the gentleman has offered a very constructive amendment, and an amendment which is very apropos in the situation which exists at the present time. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman's amendment proposes that as long as the present emergency exists, this bill will not go into operation.

Mr. MUMMA. That is so long as allocations are required. It is reasonable to suppose that allocations will continue as long as there is a scarcity of materials.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then this just delays the operation of the bill.

Mr. MUMMA. It will delay it until the materials come in fuller supply.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It delays the operation of the bill, so why would it not be better to wait until the emergency is over?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman from Minnesota opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; I am just saying—

Mr. COOLEY. Then, if I may interrupt the gentleman, agreement on the amendment should now be unanimous.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was just saying that I would rather have the bill considered on its merits at that time when the emergency is over, because none of us may be here 10 or 30 years from now when the war emergency is over. I expect the gentleman from North Carolina to be here, but perhaps the rest of us will not be here.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, I do think we should constantly keep in mind the question of postwar work. I happened to be in the building business, and I do know that before the Korean affair, there was a large number of people looking for work. I do think we should keep that in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUMMA].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARVEY: On page 7, line 5, after "of", strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000."

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, it is not necessary to have the guaranty kitty as large as the bill provides. I think \$15,000,000 will be adequate. In fact, I doubt very much if any money will ever be needed. Therefore, I think the \$15,000,000 is adequate, and I hope the Committee will accept my amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The figure of \$25,000,000, I think, was rather arbitrarily fixed in the bill, and the purpose of the revolving fund is that it may be used only when there is a default. I see no real objection to a reduction in the amount. It is not contemplated that we will sustain any substantial loss. Of course, in fixing the amount of this revolving fund, the administration will have to justify the amount before the Committee on Appropriations anyway. So I really do not see any reason for us to fight over the amount or the difference between \$25,000,000 and \$15,000,000.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is just another amendment to soften up an unpalatable bill. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] well stated a few moments ago, this bill has no place in the House at this time. If it is not intended to proceed with

construction now, then why not withdraw the bill and bring it back here at a time when construction can proceed? These two amendments are designed simply and solely to soften up the bill and try to make it more palatable. The gentleman from Kansas a few moments ago, as well as others speaking on this bill, have talked in terms of perishable products. What about nonperishable products? The gentleman from Kansas comes from a large wheat-growing State, yet we hear nothing coming from the committee today explaining to us the wide spread in prices between the producer of wheat and the consumer of bread. I would like to know what the Committee on Agriculture is doing about that as well as about some other commodities produced by farmers, in which an extortionate profit is being taken as between the farmers and the ultimate consumer. So far all we have heard about is perishable products. I assume that this bill, if enacted and if a market is constructed in Chicago, would provide facilities for the city clerk in Chicago who last year bought not less than 1,000 carloads of eggs.

I suggest that the Committee on Agriculture could, on the next trip to Chicago, while presumably investigating the high cost of living and means by which it can be solved, ascertain how it is that the city clerk can buy no less than 1,000 carloads of eggs. For what purpose and for what profit? We have heard a great deal about this Washington market, this rat-hole market in the city of New York, as it has been described by the chairman of the committee [Mr. COOLEY]. I want to ask the chairman of the committee the same question I asked on yesterday, why that rat hole, that unsanitary food market is not cleaned up by the city of New York?

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman asking me that question?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am asking the gentleman the reason why it is not cleaned up or closed.

Mr. COOLEY. The reason why it is not cleaned up is because the people owning and operating the property in the Washington Street market are opposed to doing anything about it.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the gentleman from North Carolina another question. You investigated this market in the city of New York; has wide publicity been given to your report branding this market as unsanitary?

Mr. COOLEY. It was all over the front page of the New York papers; but at the same time it is difficult to arouse the public of New York to the necessity of improving a market place that is used by the farmers of 40 States.

Mr. GROSS. Could you not interest the mayor of New York City?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; the mayor of New York City was interested; the commissioner of markets was interested, and they have an elaborate modern plan all worked out.

Mr. GROSS. This market has been branded as a rat hole yet not enough interest can be worked up in the city of New York to clean up or close up the rat hole. If the people of New York

City have no more interest than that in the handling of their foodstuffs, then you have no business asking the taxpayers of the State of Iowa to guarantee 85 percent of the money needed to build a sanitary place to distribute food in New York City. I am not for this bill.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, listening to the debate recalled to my mind the very wise words of a very eminent gentleman from the State of New York. They were delivered about 1908 when New York was considering a proposed income-tax law. I believe his words showed that he anticipated statements to be made such as those just made by the gentleman from Kansas who has told the committee that there is no other way to provide relief other than that suggested in the pending legislation. The eminent gentleman from New York was our late Chief Justice Hughes, of the United States Supreme Court. When he spoke in 1908, I believe he spoke as chief executive of New York, opposing the proposed income tax. He told the people of New York then that while they were only proposing 1½-percent income tax on the corporations that provided employment for the people of New York, and provided employees with decent places to work, the time would come when legislatures would levy as much as 8 percent in income taxes on such corporations. He said that such taxes would eventually destroy the power of those corporations to provide adequate employment because the legislatures would levy these secret taxes in increasing amounts and spend them for political purposes.

Mr. Chairman, the prophecy of the eminent gentleman from New York might have come through in toto if New York had levied such taxes and the adjoining States had not.

Less than 10 years after his statement, our National Government provided for the use of income taxes in raising revenue. The uniformity of their levy has overcome the power of the State legislatures to destroy the industry of that respective State.

Mr. Chairman, today the men who want to compete in free enterprise against these agricultural outlets in New York, heretofore described as rat holes, must pay 90 percent of their income each year if they compete successfully. If they built a sanitary and permanent structure they cannot depreciate that structure from their income in less than 20 years. They therefore will have to anticipate competing successfully for 20 years or more in order to provide this facility with the money of private industry. That, sir, is the subject we are facing. That subject is not confined to only the business of food distribution.

In the debate now pending, this House is really admitting that we in the United States have arrived at the position in the food industry or any other line of business where there is competition, where there is no longer money in private enterprise that will go into competition and run the risk of competing successfully for 20 years. I say to you, sir, that until Government expenditures

are cut and taxes are cut, and until Government removes some of the restrictions against recovery of risk money, we will continue to have situations such as that now existing at the Washington Street Market in New York.

Mr. Chairman, those people now control the market business. They know there will be no private enterprise competition. They are advised of all of the facts that the committee has heard in its hearings. It seems utterly ridiculous for us to contend that we have free enterprise in this country when the committee members supporting this bill admit that railroad cars can be unloaded for one-twelfth of their present cost at the Washington Street Market. This, Mr. Chairman, is an admission that there is no risk money in the United States to compete against existing rat holes, knowing that their cost would be one-twelfth of that paid in business competition by those operating the rat holes.

I think it is rather obvious that those involved in the Washington Street Market are willing to continue their operation with the acquiescence of police and government authorities of New York, at the expense of the consumers of New York. They have said to officials of New York that "until you work out an arrangement so that we can move from Washington Street or make improvements in Washington Street, and retain the same business that we now have, and which the present tax laws protect from competition, and guarantee our present monopoly in business, and obtain a guaranty from the National Government on moneys expended for improvement, we are not going to move and we are not going to clean up the rat holes."

Mr. Chairman, there are other rat holes in New York City. One of them is on the water front. It exists because the executives of the State and the city will not enforce law and order. At the water-front rat hole, a tribute in excess of \$20,000,000 a year is levied on people using that facility from outlying areas for work unperformed and for services not rendered. The operators of the water-front rat hole have made public statements that they use prison graduates because of the fear they instill on the water front. The hierarchy of criminals is maintained by the use of stiletos, evidenced by bodies that have been found floating in the bay, which themselves are evidence of unsolved murders.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is possible only through collusion and corruption of public officials and because the facilities involved are localized.

I want to call to your attention that the pending legislation proposes that Federal money be used to localize all outlets of agricultural commodities in the city of New York, operating through these same public officials who tolerate other rat holes and levy tribute in those rat holes on outlying areas to the full extent that the traffic will bear. It is my belief that the people of California do not want to be exposed to further taxes in order to obtain the right to pay

such tribute until the city of New York, through its officials, will enforce its laws so that the citizens of the United States can expect proper treatment under the law. The present condition constitutes a new "robber baron" in the form of a municipality, levying tribute on the modern rivers of commerce. There is nothing that this legislature can do to protect the American people from that tribute. The expenditure of Federal money or the assurance of Federal guaranty against loss will not lower the price to consumers in New York City nor will it assist the farmers of California or any other part of the United States. It is the people of New York who must clean up their rat holes and throw out their deceivers in public office who tolerate, protect, and use such rat holes. It is my sincere belief that at the next election the American people will insist that all rackets maintained through political activity be cleaned up. They will say, in effect, that freedom for the individual and freedom of business enterprise go hand in hand. The existence of one requires the other. The destruction of one will destroy the other. Free enterprise, if it existed in New York, would clean up the rat holes if they, in turn, were not protected by the law-enforcement officers of that city.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman realizes, I suppose, that 20 percent of the produce sold in the Washington Street Market in New York City comes from the State of California. The food consumed in New York City is produced in 40 States of this Union, including the State of California.

Mr. WERDEL. I will say to the gentleman that I thought the percentage of California merchandise was larger and that I believe that when the quality of California products is better known in New York, the percentage will be higher. The gentleman's question implies that I should vote with him and the administration because California is forced to pay tribute due to the breakdown of law and order in the city of New York. I want to point out to the gentleman that so long as the people of New York tolerate persons in public office who maintain rat holes for political purposes, California and all other States will continue to pay tribute if they use the rat-hole facilities. If we assume that type of law enforcement is to continue, the proposed legislation can only provide marble halls for the rats at the expense of the taxpayers of California, many of whom are those who are and will continue to be the payers of tribute.

In conclusion, this greatest legislative body in the world is now faced with a reality which has not been discussed in debate. The taxing policies of this Congress have destroyed free enterprise to the extent that it will not compete against business rat holes protected by local government even though the evidence demonstrates that their cost of operation would be one-twelfth of the cost paid by the operators of the rat holes.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BECKWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 39) to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities, pursuant to House Resolution 429 he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 39, to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 180, nays 162, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

YEAS—180

Aandchi	Chenoweth	Graham
Adair	Chipherfield	Gross
Allen, Ill.	Church	Hale
Andersen,	Clevenger	Hall,
H. Carl	Cole, Kans.	Edwin Arthur
Andresen,	Cole, N. Y.	Halleck
August H.	Colmer	Hand
Angell	Corbett	Harden
Arends	Cotton	Harrison, Va.
Armstrong	Coudert	Harrison, Wyo.
Auchincloss	Crawford	Hertel
Ayres	Crumpacker	Heselton
Bakewell	Curtis, Mo.	Hess
Baring	Curtis, Nebr.	Hoffman, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Dague	Hoffman, Mich.
Beall	Davis, Wis.	Jenkins
Belcher	Denny	Jenkins
Bennett, Fla.	Devereux	Jensen
Bennett, Mich.	D'Ewart	Jonas
Berry	Dolliver	Jonas,
Beets	Dondero	Hamilton C.
Bishop	Donovan	Jones,
Blackney	Eaton	Woodrow W.
Boggs, Del.	Ellsworth	Judd
Bolton	Elston	Kean
Bow	Fallon	Kearney
Bray	Fenton	Keating
Brehm	Fernandez	Kilburn
Brownson	Fisher	Kilday
Bryson	Ford	Lantaff
Budge	Forrester	LeCompte
Buffett	Frazier	Lowre
Burleson	Garmatz	McDonough
Bush	Gavin	McGregor
Butler	George	McMullen
Byrnes, Wis.	Golden	McVey
Canfield	Goodwin	Mack, Wash.

Mahon
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Meader
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Mumma
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Hara
Ostertag
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Rankin
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Ribicoff
Richman

Robeson
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Miss.
Rogers, Tex.
St. George
Saylor
Schwabe
Scrivner
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stefan
Taber
Talle

Teague
Thomas
Thompson,
Mich.
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Welchel
Werdel
Wheeler
Whitten
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff
Yates

NAYS—162

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews
Anfuso
Aspirall
Bailey
Barden
Bates, Ky.
Eattle
Beckworth
Bletnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Bramblett
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Buchanan
Burdick
Burnside
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Chelf
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Cox
Crosser
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Deane
DeGraffenried
Dempsey
Denton
Dorn
Doughton
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Feighan
Flood
Forand
Fugate
Furcolo
Gary
Gathings

Gordon
Gore
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Greenwood
Gregory
Hagen
Hardy
Harris
Hart
Harvey
Havebner
Hays, Ark.
Hedrick
Heller
Hill
Hillings
Hoeven
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
Ikard
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten, Mo.
Kearns
Kee
Kerr
Kirwan
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Lesinski
Lind
Lyle
McCormack
McCulloch
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Mansfield
Marshall
Morrow
Mills
Mitchell
Morgan
Morris

Morton
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
O'Toole
Passman
Patman
Perkins
Phillips
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Rains
Regan
Rhodes
Richards
Riley
Roberts
Rodino
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Seudder
Sheppard
Sieminski
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stigler
Sutton
Tackett
Thompson, Tex.
Tollefson
Trimble
Watts
Weich
Whitaker
Wickersham
Wier
Withrow
Yorty
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—88

Abbutt
Allen, La.
Baker
Barrett
Beamer
Bender
Bentsen
Boggs, La.
Boykin
Breen
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Burton
Busbey
Case
Celler
Chatham
Chudoff
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson

Delaney
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Doyle
Fine
Fogarty
Fulton
Gamble
Gwinn
Hall
Leonard W.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Heffernan
Herlong
Hinshaw
Hollifield
Howell
Hunter

Irving
Jackson, Calif.
James
Javits
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kennedy
Keogh
Kersten, Wis.
King
Klein
Kluczynski
Latham
Lucas
McCarthy
McConnell
McGrath
Machrowicz
Magee
Martin, Mass.

Miller, Calif.	Powell	Stockman
Miller, Md.	Quinn	Taylor
Morrison	Rabaut	Thornberry
Murphy	Ramsay	Vinson
Murray, Wis.	Redden	Walter
Patten	Rivers	Wharton
Patterson	Sadlak	Willis
Philbin	Sasser	Wood, Ga.
Pickett	Shelley	Wood, Idaho
Potter	Stanley	

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Vinson against.
Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. James for, with Mr. Chatham against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Doyle against.
Mr. Latham for, with Mr. King against.
Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Redden against.

Mr. Busbey for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Shelley against.
Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Walter against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Case.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Hunter.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Wood of Idaho.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Javits.

Mr. FERNANDEZ changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COLE of New York changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENDING TIME FOR USE OF MERCHANT MARINE CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 333) to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act 1935, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 5 of an act approved August 8, 1947 (Public Law 384, 80th Cong.), relating to merchant-marine construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "March 31, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1952."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the matter about which the gentleman in conjunction with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] has been working?

Mr. HART. It is the matter about which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] spoke to the gentleman a short while ago.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREST FIRE CONTROL HEADQUARTERS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 431 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1628) to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for consideration of H. R. 1628, a measure to provide headquarters for forest fire control smoke jumpers.

Smoke jumpers are those men trained in the art, and truly it is an art, of parachuting to fires in the great roadless forest areas principally in Montana and Idaho but also located in parts of Washington, Oregon, New Mexico, and California.

Because of the millions of acres of inaccessible land protected by the smoke jumpers, the Rules Committee recommends this resolution and asks favorable consideration.

In making this recommendation, the Rules Committee considered the national defense aspects of fire danger on the millions of acres of valuable forest land in the Western States on which two-thirds of the Nation's remaining virgin timber grows.

Only by great good fortune and wet weather was forest loss from Japanese wind-current fire balloons held to a minimum during World War II.

The potential danger from the hazardous landing of these balloons floated over from Japan on wind currents was one of the best-kept secrets of World War II. One landed on, and put out of

commission, a power line serving the atomic plant at Hanford. Many others landed in forest areas.

Had we had dry weather in the Pacific Northwest, such as we have had this year, the destruction from forest fire might have been a major calamity.

The national defense aspects of the smoke jumper cannot be overlooked. Fires started by an enemy either through sabotage or by dropping incendiary material from the air, or by Japanese balloons as was the case in the last war, would pose a real problem in the protection of our natural resources from fire. Hundreds of such fires could be started simultaneously all over the West. Such fires, if not quickly controlled, could cause havoc with our timber supply, burn out many of our smaller towns, disrupt transportation and communication, destroy industrial potential, and, last but not least, could disrupt military offense and defense measures.

The smoke-jumping operations operating out of Missoula would form an organization that could be expanded quickly and one which would do much to control any fires started by enemy action.

H. R. 1628 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire land at or near Missoula, Mont., and to construct thereon certain buildings and appurtenances essential to forest fire control operations of the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

Specifically, this bill would authorize the appropriation of \$970,000 for this purpose.

The lumbering and forest products industry is the most important industrial activity in the State of Washington which I have the honor to represent. The large stand of virgin timber and the millions of acres of second growth is the raw product on which this important industry depends. Fires can destroy this vital resource.

During the past abnormally dry summer, thousands of acres of fine virgin timber and excellent second growth have been destroyed by fire. Only recently fire burned 30,000 acres of excellent timberland in the Olympic National Forest. The town of Forks, Wash., was seriously threatened and if it had not been for the rapid action of the protection forces, this town would have been destroyed. From last reports only 25 small buildings were burned in Forks.

This is only one example of the many that may be cited concerning the disastrous effects of fire on the resources of my State.

The smoke-jumping project located at Missoula, Mont., consisting of 150 men, is the largest operation of its kind in the United States. It was organized by the Forest Service primarily to provide rapid initial attack on the numerous fires that start each year on the 11,000,000 acres of roadless areas in Montana and north Idaho.

There are four other areas in the far West where smoke-jumping projects are operated by the Forest Service. These units located in southern Oregon, northern Washington, southern Idaho, and New Mexico are much smaller in size

since during normal years the number of fires occurring in the inaccessible parts of these areas are not so numerous and do not require such a large number of aerial firemen. However, on occasions similar to 1951, the fire situation in these areas becomes so serious that help from the Missoula base is needed.

The great flexibility in mobility from use of aircraft for cross-country delivery of initial attack aerial fire fighters makes the Missoula operation an ideal base not only for fires occurring in Montana and Idaho, but also to back up the other smaller smoke-jumping units located in southern Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and New Mexico.

During the period the project has been operated, smoke jumpers from the Missoula base have succeeded not only in the control of numerous fires in Montana and north Idaho but also have been used with excellent results on fires in New Mexico, California, Oregon, Washington, and south Idaho. Annually, during the past 5 years, smoke jumpers from the Missoula base have jumped to fires burning in the inaccessible areas of the Gila National Forest in New Mexico.

As early as 1941 they jumped to fires on the Chelan National Forest in Washington, several hundred miles from Missoula.

As an indication of the local estimate of the value of the service I quote from a letter written by Spokane Chamber of Commerce president, Franklin Greenough, to Chairman COOLEY, of the Committee on Agriculture:

Smoke jumpers have performed a great public service in locating and restricting forest fires in this area, saving valuable national wealth and lives. New facilities would increase the efficiency of the unit materially.

On numerous occasions contingents of 15 to 75 men jumped to fires in the steep walled canyons of south Idaho. The National Park Service and the Indian Service has also benefited from the activities of this operation. As late as August of this year a contingent of 60 men from the Missoula base were flown to the Illinois airport in southern Oregon to jump to fires burning in the roadless areas of California and Oregon. At that time, several hundred fires which had started from several lightning storms passing over that region were a real threat to the natural resources of that area.

The Missoula smoke-jumping operation, because of its strength and flexibility of movement and speed of travel, is a real factor in the protection of the vast timbered areas of not only Idaho and Montana but of the entire West from devastation by fires.

The improvements contained in this bill are essential to the efficient operation of the smoke-jumping project. I recommend favorable consideration not only because they will benefit my area, but because they will make it possible for the Forest Service to do a better job of protection over all the area in the West where a majority of the saw timber supply of the United States is located.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee recommends favorable action on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of a bill that will provide for the improvement, rehabilitation, and extension of the fire-control headquarters known as the smoke jumpers in Missoula, Mont.

I want the House to understand a few things about forest fires and fire control. In the first place, no serious forest fire can develop if it can be reached soon after it starts. At the present time there is a fire raging in Oregon over some 20,000 acres of land. Had it been possible to reach that fire when it first occurred, there would be no such serious fire there today. There cannot be a serious fire if the fire fighters can reach it immediately.

There is another misconception I believe regarding the subject of forest fires. This misconception has to do with the general idea that forest fires are caused in some way by the action of machinery or men. The man-made fire is by far the least of the troubles in the western forest area. The fires that are dangerous and costly are generally caused by lightning storms, and such fires are invariably inaccessible by ordinary traffic means, so that the only way they can be reached at their beginning is from an airplane by men jumping out with parachutes carrying some fire fighting equipment with them, reaching the fire soon after it starts. For that reason we in the Far West forest region consider the operations conducted by these smoke jumpers as being vital to the maintenance and protection of our forest areas.

We feel also that the improvement of these headquarters is necessary for the improvement of that service. This is not an expenditure as such, because the cost of just one fire of any consequence at all that might be averted by the operation of the smoke-jumper squadron would cost more than the amount of money authorized in this bill. Therefore, I recommend the adoption of the rule.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is this just on Government land?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. No. The smoke jumpers will go to a fire that endangers Government land. They do not go to a fire strictly on private land unless it happens to be in an area that is generally of a public nature.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I think it was stated in the course of the hearings that there were some instances where they had contracts with the owners of private land to protect them from fire. I do not think they are very extensive or constitute a large number.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think the gentleman is correct on that. The forest area of Oregon and Washington is generally intermingled with State, county, Federal, and private ownership so that a fire starting on any acreage is dangerous to all. The smoke-jumper service would probably have contracts with the county fire patrol associations and with the associations of private owners. It is still true that no matter where the fire occurs it is dangerous to the entire area, because sometimes a fire will run over 15 or 20 miles in less than 2 hours.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. May I ask the gentleman the significance of the location at Missoula, Mont.? I think the gentleman realizes there are forests in the East as well.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I am not acquainted with the forest-fire problems in New England. I am sure you have them. However, I am intimately acquainted with the forest-fire problems of the Pacific Northwest. I have had to leave my home several times, when I was a youngster, and with others get out with only the clothes we had on our backs when a forest fire was running in our direction. So I know something about that. However, I cannot speak with reference to the problems in New England.

Mr. HALE. I can assure the gentleman we do have very destructive forest fires in Maine. May I ask if it is considered that this will be a sort of experimental station in Montana, and if it is to be contemplated that other stations will be located elsewhere? What will the program be?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I cannot answer the gentleman's question except to say that this headquarters for the smoke-jumping operation has been located in Missoula for some time. I think if I were picking the location I would place it near Boise, Idaho. However, this is the decision of the Forest Service, not mine, and I want to see this operation kept going.

Mr. HALE. I hope somebody will enlighten us further on that point.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I say in partial response to that question that the report and the hearings point out that there are over 11,000,000 acres of forest land in Idaho and Montana alone which are inaccessible from roads. The inaccessibility of the forests is one of the reasons that this work was started in Missoula and why it has been carried to its present state of perfection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is this station at Missoula the only installation of its kind in the country?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It is the only one I know about. It has been in operation

for some years. This bill is for the purpose of improving it.

Mr. HORAN. If the gentleman will yield, I am quite sure there is a smoke-jumping unit in New Mexico. There are also units at Cave Junction, Oreg.; Intercity Airport, Wash.; McCall, Idaho; and Idaho City, Idaho.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They are satellite fields. Missoula is the main one.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hope the House adopts the rule, and I favor the passage of the bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1628) to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest-fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1628, with Mr. ALBERT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, on pages 4 and 5 will be found the reasons why the present location of the forest-fire-control headquarters for parachuters is so unsatisfactory. Also on the same page, as well as on the page following will be found the purposes to which this new bill will apply.

I wish to speak in favor of my bill, H. R. 1628. This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire a small area of land at or near Missoula, Mont., and to construct thereon certain buildings essential to the successful and efficient operation of the smoke jumper and air cargo unit used by the Forest Service to control fires burning in the roadless areas of the far West and in particular Montana and north Idaho, where such areas are large and numerous.

This bill, if favorably considered, would authorize an appropriation of \$970,000 for this purpose.

H. R. 1628 is identical to H. R. 7257, passed by the House of Representatives on July 17, 1950. A similar Senate bill failed favorable consideration by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the last session due primarily, I understand, because they believed its scope should be widened to include all of the national forest areas for smoke-jumping and air-cargo operations. What they failed to understand was that the Forest Service, after long study, has concluded that Missoula,

Mont., is the most centrally located principal base of operations from which fires in the inaccessible areas of the national forests may be handled from the air. Also that it is the best situated to carry on aerial experimental work for the improvement of all phases of aerial fire operations. This does not mean that other areas will be without smoke-jumping bases. This is not the case. Other bases of smaller size operated by the Forest Service are located at McCall, Idaho; Intercity Airport, Wash.; Illinois Valley, Oreg.; and Idaho City, Idaho; with a satellite operation being located at Deming, N. Mex., each year during the months of May and June and early July. The Missoula base, because of its greater strength, is used to bolster the forces at these other bases as occasion requires, thus making it unnecessary to maintain large smoke-jumping forces in all areas strong enough to handle lightning fire situations requiring great numbers of men. In fact the Missoula base is designed not only to help handle the fires in Montana and north Idaho, but also to provide assistance to national-forest men in Oregon, Washington, California, south Idaho, and New Mexico when this is necessary.

In the northern region the United States Forest Service protects 33,000,000 acres of lands supporting many billions of board feet of very fine timber. This area has had a very sad fire history. Since 1905 in excess of 7,000,000 acres of it have been destroyed by fires. Of this amount, more than 6,000,000 acres were destroyed prior to 1933 during the period of few roads and when it was necessary to walk into most fires. With the advent of the CCC forces, numerous roads were constructed which increased the speed of travel and, thereby attack on fires from 2½ miles per hour to 15 miles per hour. During this period, 1933 to 1940, when accessibility through the efforts of the CCC forces made attack on fires more rapid, the annual acreage burned was reduced from the previous high of 230,000 acres to a new low of about 62,000 acres annually.

Of the 33,000,000 acres of land under protection by the Forest Service in Montana and north Idaho, approximately 11,000,000 acres remain roadless and with the possibility of no further extensive road construction programs in sight the Forest Service began considering the use of airplanes to speed up attack on fires.

Early in 1939 experiments were undertaken which proved that men could be transported by aircraft and parachuted to fires in the inaccessible reaches of the far West. Aerial smoke-jumping operations were undertaken in 1940 and as more experience was gained the size and number of the operations increased.

In my State, fires are more commonly caused by lightning than from human carelessness. They generally come in bunches—sometimes more than 100 fires in a single day. Most of these fires occur on the high ridges and on the slopes of mountains where there are no roads and trails are few. If they are not attacked quickly, destruction of the fine timber and other wild land resources will

result. Air travel and jumping to fires with a parachute are the only ways known to get men to these fires in time to control them.

For example, let me quote from the records of the Forest Service to demonstrate what did happen during the days of poor accessibility and before the smoke jumpers were part of the over-all protection picture. Large fires were common. During 1910 Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, also Montana, suffered tremendous losses. More than 2,000,000 acres of fine virgin forests went up in smoke; towns were destroyed; 85 lives were lost. Smoke was sighted 300 miles out at sea off the coast of Oregon and Washington. Smoke was reported 500 miles west of San Francisco and a haze interfering with nautical observations was reported to have existed for 10 days following control of this fire. Such fires have been repeated in the far West since 1910. 1919 was a bad year, with in excess of 1,000,000 acres burned. It is interesting to note that fires of these proportions have not occurred during the 10 years smoke jumpers have been used.

Since smoke jumping has been accepted as routine operation in my area, annual losses over the past 10 years have dropped to the low figure of 8,000 acres; a great reduction in burned area compared to the annual average of 230,000 acres previous to 1933 and the average annual loss of 62,000 acres during the period 1933 to 1940. Not all of this reduction can be credited to the smoke jumpers, of course. Weather was more favorable. More equipment and better fire-control practices are being used by the Forest Service today, when compared to 10, 20, or 30 years ago. However, a cold objective analysis by the Forest Service conclusively shows that great savings in the taxpayers' dollar and much less damages can be credited to the use of the smoke jumpers. The Forest Service, whose estimates are always on the conservative side, states that over a period of 20 years it may be expected that the use of smoke jumpers will result in an annual saving in suppression costs and damages of around \$450,000. Some years the savings could reach a figure of \$1,700,000.

It is common knowledge that fires can destroy the natural resources essential to the prosecution of a war. During World War II more tons of wood than steel were used. Each Liberty ship took 350,000 board feet of lumber. 50,000,000 feet of timber were required to rehabilitate the port of Naples following its capture. During the war period, 1942-45, 101,000,000 board feet of lumber were consumed by the military. Destruction of this resource by fire could prove very serious if world war III should come.

Fires disturb war effort in other ways. They disrupt railroad and highway transportation. They destroy communication lines. They smoke up the air so badly that aircraft must be grounded. They result in floods, and in many other ways can hinder military action if they are not controlled.

The Forest Service, at the instance of the Federal Office of Civil Defense, has

completed plans for the protection of our forests in the event of enemy fire attacks. The smoke-jumper organization at Missoula plays a prominent part in the field of planned fire protection to contain enemy fire attacks should they occur.

Smoke-jumping operations alone cannot contain all fires that start but they are an important source of strength to contain those fires that start in the inaccessible reaches of the far West.

I have tried to show wherein smoke jumpers have been helpful in the control of fires, where their use has saved the taxpayers money and resulted in less resource losses and where they would pay real dividends to the military during a war period involving fire attacks by an enemy.

The Missoula smoke-jumping set-up is not beneficial to my State alone. Its great flexibility of movement due to its being able to travel cross-country by air makes it also very valuable to assist in the control of fires in other States hundreds of miles removed from the Missoula base of operations. History of this unit is full of cases where help has been provided in New Mexico, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and California. During the serious fire emergency in New Mexico last spring and in California and Oregon in August of this year, men from the smoke-jumping base at Missoula were moved in to help out.

The smoke-jumping feature of the program is not the only aerial phase helpful to other areas. Air-cargo transport and delivery via the parachute is necessary for successful operations in all inaccessible fire areas. History is full of cases where equipment and facilitating gear have been moved great distances to help contain a serious fire emergency. In 1947 fire equipment was flown from Missoula to Maine. This year more than 100 tons of much-needed fire-fighting equipment were moved to New Mexico where a serious fire situation was in progress. There are many other similar cases.

The primary reasons for this bill are to provide adequate housing, warehousing, and facilitating services for the aerial operations at Missoula, Mont. This bill, if enacted into law, will also allow the Forest Service to move its base of operations from Hale Field to the new municipal airport owned by the county.

The improvements, if provided at the municipal airport, will bring about more efficient operations. This will result in direct savings to the taxpayers of around \$100,000 per year compared to the present base of operations centered around Hale Field. This saving is in addition to the estimated annual saving of \$450,000 when comparing smoke-jumping attack with conventional ground methods.

Hale Field, the present base of operations near Missoula, is graveled, is not lighted for night operations, has short runways, is near dangerous mountain obstructions and requires flying low on take off and landings over residential areas and schools. Tenure is insecure due to demands for the use of this land for residential purposes.

XCVII—767

The operation is presently housed in old CCC buildings located in several places, some removed as much as 32 miles from Missoula. These buildings are old, have been fully depreciated, with tenure insecure, since they are located on rented ground. Because of the temporary nature of the buildings and the dilapidated facilities being used, they are not only a fire trap but also are considered unsuitable as living quarters—space is too limited, sanitation is poor.

The city of Missoula, the county, and the CAA have cooperated in the construction of a county municipal airport a few miles out of Missoula, spending about \$4,000,000 for this purpose. This field has excellent surfaced runways 7,000 feet long, is far removed from dangerous mountainous obstructions, does not require low-level flying over the city of Missoula, is lighted for night operations so important to fire control, and is otherwise ideally suited as a base for aerial fire control operations. The county will sell or allow a friendly condemnation suit involving a plot of land to be used as the aerial base. The county of Missoula will sell the necessary site to the Forest Service for the low sum of \$2,000. Also they will enter into a lease with the Forest Service allowing their access to the runways and full and free use of the airport for an undetermined long period of years—probably 99 if it is legal for them to do this.

This bill contemplates the acquisition of a site at the county municipal airport, on which will be constructed the bare essentials for the efficient operation of an aerial unit by the Forest Service for the control of forest fires.

I recommend favorable consideration of H. R. 1623.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON. Could the gentleman tell us briefly just how this fire-fighting unit would help us with our forest fires in northern California? The gentleman mentioned the State of California. The great forests in our State have suffered a very devastating fire this year in the northeast part of the State. How would this unit help us?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In the past we have sent forest fire parachuters from Missoula to the southern and northern part of California to help put the fires out which have occurred there. Southern California is within a 4- to 5-hour flying range of the Missoula airport. We have sent these parachuters not only to northern and southern California to help put out fires there, but also to New Mexico on several occasions as well.

Mr. JOHNSON. You say it is within a 4-hour flight of southern California? What kind of planes do they use that go that fast?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In emergency they will use C-47's, but usually they will use in the immediate vicinity of Missoula a trimotor Ford which goes slow enough to allow the men to jump. Also at the present time they have three Stinson Travelers, I believe.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think the gentleman must be mistaken about the 4 hours, because I have ridden in these C-47's and they do not travel anywhere near that fast.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We have gotten down into California and New Mexico within a 4- to 5-hour flying period.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Is there not a unit working out of Cave Junction, Ore.?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is a unit working out of Cave Junction and there is one at McCall, Idaho, and one at Idaho City, Idaho. Those, of course, are all under the Missoula operations and they are shipped out as fire occurs in different areas.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I serve, as the gentleman probably knows, on the subcommittee that has charge of forest protection appropriations. We do look to the further refinement of this sort of work not only to an increase in efficiency in the matter of protection of the forests but eventually a cutting down of the size of the appropriations needed for that sort of work.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct; and I may say to the gentleman that the State of Washington which he has so ably represented here for the past 9 years has been vigorous in its support of this proposed legislation.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MUMMA. Speaking of planes, I read the hearing on this bill and failed to see a word about helicopters anywhere in the hearings. It strikes me in view of what has been done in Korea with helicopters their ability to come down in an exact spot where needed, there being no element of chance about it, that serious consideration should be given to their use in connection with fire fighting operations.

I happen to have fought a lot of forest fires in my life. I have observed parachute drops and the dropping of men and supplies, and am convinced of their great usefulness. But I think we should begin giving consideration to their use now as we debate this bill. For instance, I think the hangar would have to be designed with helicopters in mind.

I notice there is another item in the bill for parachutes. I have had some experience observing parachute operations in the Middle East, in Pennsylvania. It seems to me that by use of the helicopter you would eliminate a lot of the expense for parachutes. Some \$120,000 is contained for that purpose. It seems to me that quite a lot of that money would not be necessary were helicopters put into use, and I think we should bear this in mind as we consider the bill.

Answering the gentleman from Maine as to the use of airplanes in his section, I have never been in Maine, but in the eastern part of the United States generally the forests are much more accessible, at least they are in Pennsylvania and

throughout the East than they are in the West due to the unique system of roads which exists throughout the area, roads and forest trails built by the CCC boys. Almost any spot in this area can be reached within a very short time by automobile. I realize that the question is very much different in the West, but in the eastern part of the United States there is a great system of roads. I think this is a very good bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I appreciate his contribution very much. I know something of the fine reputation he has in the field of forestry. Insofar as helicopters are concerned I am quite sure they will be given serious consideration and much weight will be placed on the gentleman's suggestion, especially in view of the great development in helicopters which has occurred in the last 3 or 4 years, especially through their use by the Marine Corps, not only in low-flying operations, low enough to drop the men and the loads, but to make such landings as were made a week ago when they landed some 250 men on a mountain top in Korea. So I have every confidence that the Forest Service will take into consideration what the gentleman has said and do what it can to bring about further efficiency in its fire-fighting operations.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. As I understand, this bill is identical or practically the same bill as the gentleman introduced a year ago which passed the House by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. GRANGER. I know the gentleman has been very diligent in the preparation of and advocating this legislation. The entire western country is indebted to the gentleman from Montana for the great effort he has made.

I think this is a good bill, and in view of the fact that even now forest fires are raging in the high mountains of the western country I think it would be false economy if this Congress did not at this time take measures to make possible adequate facilities with which to fight these devastating fires.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I know that he understands this measure not only because he comes from the Rocky Mountain area, as I do, but because he himself was in charge of the hearings on this bill a year ago.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I wish to invite the attention of the gentleman and also others interested in fire fighting that the Forest Service is now using helicopters; they have several under lease and are using them for experimental purposes, administrative purposes, and so on; and, presumably, they will, as soon as the occasion presents itself, make use of them for fire-fighting purposes. So that is already under way and they are making progress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Mr. Chairman, at the present time the smoke-jumping operation in Missoula is being conducted from a field known as Hale Field. It is a gravel field, it has short runways, it is unlighted, it is close to the mountains, and because of these characteristics there can be no night take-offs or night landings. By moving to the other field, the modern Missoula County Airport, built at a cost of \$4,000,000, owned by the county of Missoula, having runways 7,000 to 8,000 feet in length, we will be able to be more efficient in operating this very fine service. We will have a lighted field, we will be able to take off at night and we will be able to land at night. We will save under this new set-up something like \$100,000 a year in addition to the \$450,000 a year which this service now saves when you compare it with the older and more inefficient methods of going to a fire on foot or going in by truck or on horseback.

I hope that this committee in its wisdom will give this matter its most serious consideration and will approve this vitally needed facility which will mean so much in the saving of our natural resources and which will be economical as well.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure I would be moved to vote for this legislation simply by reason of the fine address and the accurate facts brought forth in the speech just made by the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. His remarks were very persuasive. But, in addition to Mr. MANSFIELD's remarks, I have a very personal reason for supporting this legislation, and I beg your pardon for making it personal. When you talk about fire jumpers, may I say that in the Saturday Evening Post of April 23, 1951, there appeared a very interesting article on fire jumpers. This article is very interesting to me because it was written by my nephew, Starr Jenkins. He is the son of my deceased brother, Newton Jenkins. Although he was brought up in the great city of Chicago he had in him the urge that would be satisfied best by the call of the wild.

Starr had been a fire jumper for some little time before he wrote this article. His brother also was a fire jumper. Starr is now a teacher in one of the schools out there in the great West.

Starr, in his story, gives a very graphic account of the work of these fire jumpers. It must have been worth while else it would not have been accepted by the Saturday Evening Post. The title of this article is "We Jump Into Fire." I wish I could give you some of the graphic language that he uses in describing the work of these heroic young men who risk their lives for the benefit of the best interests of the country. I shall later get leave of the House to have his whole article printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since it is a report of the activities of a Government agency it would be appropriate. I want to give you a story of one incident that he describes graphically. He said that on a certain

day while attached to the Missoula station, about which we are talking today, he was assigned with another boy to take a jump which he describes completely in his article. He said there were I think, eight boys selected to go immediately to a distant fire. The man who assigned the work called out two to go immediately. They were Jenkins and another man. They went in their plane to do the work, leaving four boys there to go at another time. When he came back those four boys who had gone to another fire never came back. They had given their lives for their country and in line of duty. So these fires that we talk about today on the floor of Congress not only are destructive of fine timber but they are destructive of fine boys. These fire fighters fight heroically and die stoically. God bless them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I read that article also and it was a very well prepared and a very accurate article. Speaking of some of the boys who did not come back, we had this tragedy at Man Gulch in western Montana a year ago last August, at which time 13 fire fighters did not come back.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this legislation. From research and from the practical results that have been procured it is shown conclusively that this procedure and this method of fire fighting has become one of the most effective in control of forest fires of any method that has ever been adopted by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I had not been familiar with this legislation before it came to us today, and I was not aware of the existence of the situation at Missoula, Mont. Certainly I am enthusiastically in favor of the legislation.

However, since the question has been brought up, I want to say that more than half of my State of Maine is forest area. The same can be said of the States of New Hampshire and Vermont. There are enormous forest areas in New York and Pennsylvania and, of course, in the whole Allegheny region as well, including the Great Smoky region in the South.

It has been suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I think by one or two others, that the forest areas in our part of the country are more readily accessible than in the great Northwest. That may be true, but it is only a matter of degree. Certainly there are large forest areas in the State of Maine, completely inaccessible to highways, where the only practicable way of travel, except aerial travel, is either afoot or by canoe. This is not good enough for putting out forest fires.

In 1947 we had the most destructive series of forest fires in the history of the

State of Maine. There were villages in my district which were completely wiped out. There were areas in which the fire fighters maintained camps day and night for a long period of time, under the most rigorous conditions as to getting in supplies, lack of sleep, and so on. Parts of the State were practically on a war footing. The town of Bar Harbor, which is one of the principal beauty spots of Maine, suffered an enormous property loss in buildings destroyed and suffered damage to its surrounding forests and its natural beauty which it will take at least a half century to repair.

Certainly if forest-fire-control stations of this Missoula type are to be established, as they should be, they should be established also in the New England area and in other parts of the East. I do very earnestly solicit attention to this problem. Our eastern forests are as much a great national asset as are those of the Northwest and West. When forest areas anywhere are ravaged or destroyed the entire Nation suffers, and not merely a section.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to rise in support of this bill introduced by my colleague from the western district of Montana.

In my youth I was a forest ranger and had some experience with forest-fire fighting in working with the United States Forest Service in Montana. In those days we used to go to fires on horseback, with pack horses to carry in our equipment, or else we went on foot. That is no way to get to a fire in this day and age, and we generally got there too late and with too little. The fire was at a stage by the time we arrived where it was most difficult to handle.

Since those days a lot has been learned about fighting forest fires. New ways, new equipment, better methods have been experimented with and developed, until now they are used throughout the West when forest fires occur.

In the Missoula area there are some 11,000,000 acres of virgin timber. There is probably more virgin timber in that area than anywhere else in the United States, possibly two-thirds of what is left in the United States. The district office of the United States Forest Service is located at Missoula. The university students in the forestry school that help with forest-fire protection during the summer, are in Missoula. All these factors added together make this an ideal spot to put this enlarged airport and the equipment and facilities, buildings, parachute lofts, and things like that, that are necessary in modern fire fighting.

Largely this fire fighting is done with contract planes. I believe at Missoula the Forest Service owns only three that it uses itself. The rest are contract planes. They also cooperate with the United States Air Force in fighting fires. All these things added together, plus increased knowledge of how to fight fires, up-to-date equipment, facilities for manpower, and an enlarged airfield at Missoula, and added buildings and equipment, make it possible to fight forest fires

in this area of virgin timber with modern, up-to-date methods.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to my colleague from Montana that he has been very vigorous in support of this measure, and we are both very grateful to our colleagues from Washington, Oregon, and Idaho for the fine support they in turn have given us in our efforts to bring this bill to the attention of the House and get it passed.

Mr. D'EWART. I agree with my colleague from Montana.

I hope that later facilities will be available not only to our State but surrounding States where there is such a large amount of timber.

It adds to the flexibility of the crews to have these airfields and the planes necessary for fire fighting. Manpower and equipment can be moved quickly from one fire to another.

Fires in these inaccessible areas generally start from lightning. There are no roads and very few trails. If you can get there quickly after it is spotted by what we call spotters on high peaks, you can put the fire out with few men and with little cost, and with a great saving of timber. Therefore, these new facilities necessary for fighting fires adds greatly to the saving of timber, and adds greatly to the saving in manpower in fire fighting.

The Forest Service expects to increase the number of parachute jumpers at this point, and I think rightly so, because by increasing the number of those jumpers they will decrease the number of men that are actually needed on the fires, because the men get there before the fire spreads and is out of hand. When one of these fires gets out of hand it is almost impossible to stop it before it burns itself out or before it gets to the top of a ridge where you can backfire and stop it in that way, and this ordinarily takes a large and expensive crew.

This is a good bill. I want to compliment my colleague from western Montana on bringing it up, and I am glad to have this opportunity to support it before the House.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill. Recently the House, in my opinion, passed one of the most basic and essential acts for the care of our forests that has ever been passed. As I said at that time, one of the great national resources of this country is our forests. I think as a country we have been very careless and indifferent about the care of our forests. The forests mean more than lumber. The forests mean much to the generations that are to come. We must understand that in the eastern part of our country the United States Government has title to very little forest land, while in the West, where this work is to be done and where the work is being done, all the forest areas in those sections belong to the United States. It belongs to the people and not to the States.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Does not the gentleman think that a privately owned forest is just as much a national asset as a Government-owned forest?

Mr. HILL. Exactly. The problems you have are no less because the forest lands belong to the State of Maine than they are if they belong to the United States. So I am perfectly in accord with the gentleman when he said on the floor of the House that some fire protection more than we now have should be built up for all of the forests throughout the United States.

I can think of only one great tragedy that is even comparable to a forest fire, and that is a flood.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Colorado has suggested that we should at least have an interest in these forests. With that I quite agree. As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have a real interest. I should like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that we have forests destroyed by causes other than fire. I have in mind the great Englemann spruce forest of Colorado. I hope the House some day will take up the question of protecting that great forest in Colorado as well as the bill which we are now considering to prevent fires.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I for one believe that we should protect these forests not only from fire but from pests as well, I might say to the gentleman that not long ago as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, I visited the Superior Forest in Minnesota. There we discovered that it was not the beetle but another type of pest that was destroying this forest. Unless we are on our toes, and unless we set up a program which will protect these forests in the days to come, other forests will be destroyed.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. In company with two other members of the Committee on Appropriation, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, about 2 weeks ago I visited the watershed in Colorado. It is an amazing place because there, within a few hundred miles, four great rivers originate way up in the Rockies—the Rio Grande, the Arkansas, the Platte, and the Colorado River. During the course of a 250-mile airplane trip, we flew over half a million acres of dead spruce. Bark beetles had devastated it. I asked the regional forester what he would do in case fire broke out there. He said they would dash in and do the best they could with bulldozers. There are no roads there. Then, they would push those dead trees around, and try to make a fire wall. He said first, however, that they would call on Idaho City; McCall, Idaho; or Missoula; or Deming, N. Mex., for smoke jumpers. I mentioned this because there

watersheds in Colorado are not only important to the people of Denver and its environs as well as the more outlying sections, but the water which supplies Kansas City, Mo., and the water that supplies Los Angeles and Brownsville, Tex., and even Fort Collins, originates in that area. So this smoke jumping and protection of our watersheds, whether the trees are dead or alive, is important to the people of a very wide area.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, just another word about the forests. Let us keep in mind that the undergrowth and the pine needles and the fine material that develops under these trees becomes a sort of sponge or blotter which holds this water when it falls in these mountain areas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Along the very line of reasoning that the gentleman has spoken one has only to look at Greece and China today to see what deforestation has done. That ought to bring home to us, as the gentleman has so well put it, the importance of this great natural resource which belongs to all of the people.

Mr. HILL. I hope you understand that when the water falls on this forest area, if there is nothing but naked hillsides to absorb or hold the moisture as it falls, then it all collects in great torrents and down the stream it goes, and with the terrific slope or with the number of feet that the water falls per mile, the water has tremendous power and it tears up the canyons and washes away the soil and it is good-by to the value of that area as a watershed. I think the word "watershed" some times does not mean what it should in the minds of our people. Shed is not a correct expression. It should be called a water-protection area. That is what it becomes, if we take care of it. But do not forget that when you fail to take care of it, it does not become the protection it was meant to be. Whereas when a fire gets started, and it is burned over forest land you have nothing but ashes, no cover no holding of moisture content. It takes 60 to 100 years to build up these areas.

In closing, let me say there is nothing like an airplane to speed the fire fighters to where the fire exists. You have the towers in the forests where the foresters are, with the aid of their glasses, able to locate the blaze and a quick run to the location saves many acres of timber.

The fire fighters can be dropped near the fire by parachute. These men are perfectionists enough not to parachute down into the trees. They are expert parachute jumpers. In the Superior Forest we looked over the gear. These men have the finest of fire-fighting equipment. They have the newest types of fire-fighting equipment. When they land with their supplies they are all ready to knock the fire out over an area of many square feet. We have a fire bomb which actually smothers the fire.

In these areas that do not have any roads, men may be parachuted down at the right point at the right time to extinguish the fire. You will notice in the short report that this committee made that they say at least \$150,000 a year may be saved. That is a conservative estimate. A forest fire promptly put out may mean thousands of acres of timberland saved and who can value such saving?

I hope the bill passes without a single vote against it, it is constructive legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to myself.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the great Northwest, and the timber regions of that part of the country. I regard this matter as a matter of national importance. I think it is a very reasonable insurance premium for us to pay to provide the money to improve and build facilities which will be used in the protection of one of the greatest natural resources of our Nation. The fact is that two-thirds of the virgin timber remaining in America is in this particular area, and that should impress us with the importance of what we are attempting to do here. I do not think this is a matter which will result in benefiting only one or two States, I think it will result in a general benefit, because it is in the interest of the general welfare of all of the people of this great country. I hope the bill will be adopted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER].

Mr. SITTLER. I speak briefly to say that I favor this bill.

As a boy one of my ambitions was to become a forester and forest fire fighter, and I have had a love of the forest ever since. Moreover, it has been my good fortune to travel in the West and to learn to love our great National Forests and to meet and know some of the members of the Forest Service. I have come to admire them very much. They are a sincere, devoted, and thoroughly reliable group of Government employees. I agree with what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has just said because we in Pennsylvania also have great forests, although admittedly fires in them would be rather more accessible than those in some of the other great States of the West.

I hope our Pennsylvania fire fighters may learn from the procedures that are developed at Missoula, methods that may help them more effectively to serve our State and save Pennsylvania forests as well.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I take this time so as to incorporate in the record of the discussion on this bill two or three facts, and I wish to ask the gentleman from Montana one or two questions for the purpose of clarifying the record regarding the bill.

Is it not true that the purpose of the bill is for the expansion and renovation and improvement of a headquarters for the smoke jumpers of the Forest Service?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say to the gentleman from Oregon that that is correct; it involves a transfer from the very unsafe Hale Field to the new modern Missoula County Airport, and it will bring about a greater concentration of operations and more efficient use of the facilities.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. And this headquarters is a base of operation for this type of forest-fire fighting for the entire area of the West. Is not that true?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, primarily for the Pacific Northwest, but in its operations extending as far south as California and New Mexico, as has been demonstrated on many occasions.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. If I am wrong in these further assumptions I wish the gentleman from Montana would correct me. As I understand it, the smoke-jumper headquarters we are discussing now is a base of operations for the maintenance, repair, the location of headquarters personnel, and a central communications center to which all of the other regions and individual national forests can appeal when there is fire danger or when lightning has set some fire in their areas. This headquarters, with its personnel and equipment, will be available and smoke jumpers sent out with proper equipment and supplies to the areas that are then threatened. Is that about the way it will work?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman is absolutely correct; and I want to say in addition, referring to a point raised by the gentleman from Maine, that in 1947 during the fire he described to the House we shipped fire-fighting equipment from Missoula, Mont., to help put down this outbreak in the State of Maine.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The point that I want to be sure is clear both in the record and to the House is that the institution we are talking about and that is affected by this bill is not a local affair at all. We in the State of Oregon are as much interested in it as the people in the Southwest or in the State of Washington, that there must be a central base of operations for a complicated system of this kind; there must be made permanent a place for the recruitment and housing of smoke-jumper personnel and a central communications center for the dispatch of these operations. That is the point I want to make.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I thank the gentleman and say that every statement he has made is correct.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. D'EWART. I think the gentleman should add another factor and that is the study and development of new and better methods of fighting forest fires. This headquarters is close to a university where there is a very fine forestry school; it is close to the district forestry office; and, therefore, the facilities are there to make these studies for

better and more advanced methods of fighting fire and the kind of operations we have been discussing here.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman and merely want to repeat what I said earlier today, that in forest-fire language there is no such thing as a serious forest fire if that fire can be reached as soon as it starts; serious forest fires are only those fires which go out of control before it is possible for men to reach the fire with fighting equipment; and equipment, generally speaking, is a good shovel. Men with good shovels can stop any fire from becoming a serious fire if they get to it in time. That is the purpose of the whole headquarters set-up, to establish a system of organization for reaching fires by air before they become serious.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to acquire by donation, purchase, and/or condemnation such tract or tracts of land, at or near Missoula, Mont., as in his judgment may be suitable for the construction thereon of fire control smoke jumper headquarters, air cargo supply base, and other facilities, and said land upon acceptance of title to be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to lands acquired under the act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 515, 516).

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "authorized", add the following: "when suitable arrangements have been made for the use of airport facilities."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, by contract or otherwise, to cause to be planned, designed, and constructed on said land, such buildings as in his judgment may be suitable as fire control smoke jumper headquarters, air cargo supply base, and other facilities, and including the purchase and installation of necessary equipment, the making of sewer, water, gas, electrical and other connections, and the construction of such roadways, sidewalks, landscaping, and approaches as may be required.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$970,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1951, enter into contracts for the acquisition of the land and for the construction of the buildings and other installations herein authorized, to an amount not in excess of \$500,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: Page 2, line 18, strike out "1951" and insert "1953."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this amendment was agreed to by the committee but inadvertently it was not changed in the bill. It simply changes the date of 1951 to 1953.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALBERT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1628) to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 431 he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY DUPLICATION AND OVERLAPPING OF TAXES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 414, Rept. No. 1056), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to investigate and study duplication and overlapping of Federal, State, and local government taxes, and the means and method of accomplishing the elimination of such overlapping and duplication.

The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to subpoena witnesses, to sit and act at such times and places during the life of the committee as it shall designate; to employ an executive secretary; and to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it may deem necessary (without regard to the civil service laws, but subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended). The committee may utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as

may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS OF FOURTH CLASS PARCEL POST MAIL

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 439, Rept. No. 1057), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bills for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAWS NUMBERED 815 AND 874 OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 440, Rept. No. 1058), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5411) to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar to be called on Wednesday of next week, instead of being called on Monday and Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the address delivered by President Truman at the peace conference in San Francisco.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by President Truman at the peace conference in San Francisco:

I am glad to welcome you to this conference for signing the treaty of peace with Japan. The people of the United States are honored to serve as hosts for this meeting.

Six years ago the nations represented at this conference were engaged in a bitter and costly war. Nevertheless, these nations and others came together here, in this very hall, to set up the United Nations as the first essential step toward a firm and lasting peace.

Today, we meet here again to take another step along the road to peace. On this occasion, it is our purpose to conclude a treaty of peace with a country we were fighting in 1945. We meet to restore our former enemy to the community of peaceful nations.

The treaty we are gathered here to sign has not been drawn in a spirit of revenge. The treaty reflects the spirit in which we carried on the war. The principles for which we fought were clearly set forth by President Franklin D. Roosevelt right after Pearl Harbor. On December 9, 1941, in a broadcast to the American people, he said:

"When we resort to force, as now we must, we are determined that this force shall be directed toward ultimate good as well as against immediate evil. * * * We are now in the midst of a war, not for conquest, not for vengeance, but for a world in which this Nation, and all that this Nation represents, will be safe for our children."

POINTS TO NEW THREATS OF AGGRESSION IN WORLD

That is our purpose here today as we gather to sign the peace treaty. We are trying to build a world in which the children of all nations can live together in peace. We hope we are attaining the ultimate good to which President Roosevelt referred.

Unfortunately, today, the world is faced with new threats of aggression. Many of the countries represented here are now engaged in a hard fight to uphold the United Nations against international law-breaking. But we have not forgotten that our goal is peace. We will not let that happen now, any more than we let the existence of war in 1945 hold up our efforts for the United Nations.

The people of all our countries long for one thing above all else, and they are determined to have it. What they want is a world at peace—a world where there is justice and freedom for all men and all nations. Our peoples demand of us that we take every possible measure to reach that goal.

We who stand ready to sign this treaty with Japan believe in peace. We believe in peace based on freedom and international justice. We know that a free and independent people have more vigor and staying power and can do more to help secure the peace, than a people held under alien control. We believe that the whole great effort for peace will be strengthened if Japan is now restored to independence and linked to other free nations by ties of mutual friendship and responsibility.

LAUDS MAC ARTHUR'S WORK AS OCCUPATION CHIEF

Since the fighting ended in 1945, Japan has been an occupied country. The occupation was designed by the wartime allies to

prevent future Japanese aggression, and to establish Japan as a peaceful and democratic country, prepared to return to the family of nations.

The United States, as the principal occupying power, was given a special responsibility to carry out these objectives. It is our judgment that they have been achieved.

I wish on this occasion to express the pride that my countrymen and I feel in the way in which the allied occupation has been carried out. Its success has been due to the devoted efforts of many thousands of people serving under the outstanding leadership of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and his successor, Gen. Matthew Ridgway.

I would also like to pay tribute to the impressive effort put forward by the people of Japan in this period. They have fully complied with the surrender terms. They have cooperated fully in carrying out the purposes of the occupation.

The result has been a remarkable and unprecedented period of progress in Japanese history. Japan today is a very different country from what it was 6 years ago.

The old militarism has been swept away. This has been done not just by occupation edict, but by the overwhelming will of the Japanese people themselves.

The secret police and the police-state methods used by the former government have been abolished.

The new Japanese constitution provides a bill of rights for all citizens and establishes a government truly representative of the people.

The Japanese people now have universal suffrage, and they are taking a vigorous part in their government. In recent local elections, more than 90 percent of those eligible have voted.

Japanese women now vote and take part in the government and enjoy full democratic rights for the first time.

Free and independent labor unions have been established, and farm cooperatives have been greatly expanded.

The monopolies that used to have such a stranglehold on the Japanese economy have been substantially broken up.

Remarkable progress has been made in land reform. Over 5,000,000 acres of land have been purchased from the old landlords and sold to working farmers. Today about 90 percent of all cultivated land belongs to those who work on it, as compared with less than 50 percent in 1945. This is a great achievement, full of meaning for all Asia.

SAYS UNITED STATES STILL REMEMBERS PEARL HARBOR AND BATAAN

Through these and other reforms, the Japanese people have been developing a stable economy and a democratic society. They still have a long way to go, but they are well on the road to building a new Japan, dedicated to the arts of peace and the well-being of the people.

Because of these accomplishments, it is possible at this time to restore full sovereignty to the Japanese people.

This does not mean that the slate has been wiped clean. The United States has not forgotten Pearl Harbor or Bataan, and many of the other nations represented here have similar memories that will not easily be erased. The new Japan will not find the world entirely friendly and trusting. It will have to keep on working to win the friendship and trust of other peoples over the years to come.

But the foundations for a peaceful future have been laid. It is now time to move ahead with the restoration of normal relations between Japan and the rest of the world.

This conference is the result of a year of cooperative effort toward that end.

A year ago this month, at my request, Mr. John Foster Dulles began to consult

other governments about a treaty of peace with Japan. Mr. Dulles has performed this task faithfully and well, guided by the highest traditions of statesmanship.

There were, of course, differences of opinion among the nations concerned as to many of the matters covered by this treaty. The text of the treaty now before us is the product of long and patient negotiations, among many nations, which were undertaken to reconcile these differences.

DESCRIBES THE TREATY AS ONE THAT WILL WORK

I think it is fair to say that it is a good treaty. It takes account of the principal desires and ultimate interests of all the participants. It is fair to both victor and vanquished.

But more than that, it is a treaty that will work. It does not contain the seeds of another war. It is a treaty of reconciliation, which looks to the future, not the past.

The treaty reestablishes Japan as a sovereign, independent nation. It provides for the restoration of Japanese trade with other nations, and it imposes no restrictions upon Japan's access to raw materials.

The treaty recognizes the principle that Japan should make reparations to the countries which suffered from its aggression. But it does not saddle the Japanese people with a hopeless burden of reparations which would crush their economy in the years to come.

In all these respects, the treaty takes account of the peaceful advances the Japanese people have made in recent years, and seeks to establish the conditions for further progress. However, there is one thing we must all recognize. There can be no progress unless the Japanese people and their neighbors in the Pacific are made secure against the threat of aggression.

At the present time, the Pacific area is gravely affected by outright aggression and by the threat of further armed attack. One of our primary concerns in making peace with Japan, therefore, is to make Japan secure against aggression and to provide that Japan, in its turn, will so conduct itself as not to endanger the security of other nations. To accomplish this, it is important to bring Japan under the principles of the United Nations, and within the protection of the mutual obligations of United Nations members.

NOTES JAPAN'S PROMISE NOT TO ENGAGE IN AGGRESSION

The treaty expresses Japan's intention to apply for membership in the United Nations. The other countries who sign the treaty can be counted on to work for the admission of Japan to membership. But even so, there may be delays before Japan can be admitted.

Under the treaty, therefore, the Japanese people bind themselves to accept immediately the basic obligations of a United Nations member—namely, to refrain from aggression, to settle disputes peacefully; and to support the efforts of the United Nations to maintain the peace. At the same time, the other nations who sign the treaty specifically recognize that Japan is entitled to the protection of the United Nations Charter.

In a sense, these provisions are the heart of this treaty. Under them, Japan becomes part of the community of nations pledged to outlaw aggression and to support a world order based on justice.

This tying together of the Japanese peace treaty and the United Nations Charter is a long step toward building security in the Pacific. But more than this is needed.

In the present world situation, it has been necessary to buttress the peaceful principles of the United Nations Charter with regional arrangements for the common defense against aggression. If real security is to be attained in the Pacific, the free nations in that area must find means to work together for the common defense.

The United States recognizes this fact. Our people have suffered from past aggression in the Pacific and are determined that this country shall do its part for peace there. In recent days, we have joined with other Pacific nations in important mutual security agreements.

POINTS TO NEW TREATIES WITH NATIONS OF PACIFIC

Last Thursday, the Philippines and the United States signed a treaty of mutual defense. Under this treaty, each country recognizes that an armed attack on the other in the Pacific area would be dangerous to its own peace and safety, and declares that it would act to meet the common danger.

Last Saturday, a similar security treaty was signed by Australia, New Zealand, and the United States.

These treaties are initial steps toward the consolidation of peace in the Pacific.

It is vital that Japan be included as soon as possible in appropriate security arrangements for keeping peace in the Pacific. This is necessary for her own protection and the protection of other countries.

The peace treaty, therefore, recognizes that Japan, as a sovereign nation, must possess the right of self-defense and the right to join in defense arrangements with other countries under the United Nations Charter.

The development of regional arrangements for defense in the Pacific will mean that such Japanese defense forces as may be created would be associated with the defense forces of other nations in the area. Japan's security would depend exclusively on Japanese forces but on interrelated security arrangements with other countries. The Japanese contribution by itself would not constitute an offensive threat. But Japanese forces, together with forces of other nations, would provide mutual security against threats to the independence of the nations of the Pacific, including Japan.

EXPLAINS PLAN TO KEEP UNITED STATES TROOPS IN JAPAN

At present, of course, Japan is totally unarmed. In view of the open aggression taking place near Japan the Japanese Government has requested the United States to enter into a bilateral treaty for Japan's immediate security. Under such a treaty, the United States would maintain armed forces in Japan for the time being as a contribution to international peace and to Japan's defense against attack.

Security arrangements are essential in a world in danger. In the Pacific as in other parts of the world, social and economic progress is impossible unless there is a shield which protects men from the paralysis of fear.

But our great goal, our major purpose, is not just to build bigger and stronger shields. What we want to do is to advance as rapidly as we can, the great constructive tasks of human progress.

We in the United States respect and support the many new free and independent nations in the Pacific area and Asia.

We want to see them grow and prosper, as equal partners in the community of independent nations of both east and west. We want to cooperate with them, to help them in their agricultural and in industrial development. We wish to see these nations attain in dignity and freedom a better life for their peoples, for that is the road to world peace.

GREAT ECONOMIC CHANGES IN ASIA RECOGNIZED

These countries have a rich historical and cultural heritage. Today, their people are experiencing great economic and social change. They are stirred by a new zeal for progress and independence. Already, we have seen some of the progress that can be made—progress in stamping out malaria, in building schools and training teachers, in

growing more food and creating new industries. Immense opportunities lie ahead if these countries can pursue their national destinies in a partnership of peace, free from the fear of aggression.

Under this peace treaty, we believe Japan can and will join in this partnership of peace.

We look forward to the contribution which the New Japan, with its rich culture and its dedication to peace, can bring to the community of nations. We expect this contribution to grow over the years, for the signing of a peace treaty is but one part of the process of making peace. When aggression and war have severed relations between nations, many ties which bind one nation to the others are cut. Making peace is like repairing the many strands of an intercontinental cable; each strand must be spliced separately and patiently, until the full flow of communication has been restored.

There is no other way to bring lasting peace than this slow and patient process, step by step, of mending and strengthening the cables of communication, of understanding between nations.

In this San Francisco conference, we have the opportunity to take one vital step toward lasting peace. Our specific task here is to conclude the treaty of peace with Japan. That will be a great step toward general peace in the Pacific.

SAYS PEACE IN KOREA IS MOST PRESSING ISSUE

There are other steps which need to be taken. The most important of these is the restoration of peace and security in Korea. With Japan returned to its place in the family of nations, and with the people of Korea secure, free, and united, it should be possible to find ways to settle other problems in the Pacific which now threaten the peace.

The United States has made clear on many occasions its desire to explore with other governments at the proper time and in the proper forum how this might be accomplished.

There are many well established ways in which next steps can be explored, if there is a genuine desire for peace in all quarters.

But these are not matters which can be dealt with in our present conference. We have come here to take a single step—but a step of the utmost importance.

The treaty now before us offers more than talk of peace; it offers action for peace. This conference will show, therefore, who seeks to make peace, and who seeks to prevent it; who wishes to put an end to war, and who wishes to continue it.

We believe this treaty will have the support of all those nations that honestly desire to reduce the tensions which now grip the world.

I pray that we shall all be united in taking this step to advance us toward greater harmony and understanding.

As we approach the peace table, let us be free of malice and hate, to the end that from here on there shall be neither victors nor vanquished among us, but only equals in the partnership of peace.

OUR NEW FRONTIER IS DIXIE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, years ago, Henry W. Grady, a great statesman from the State of Georgia, speaking in Massachusetts, uttered a prophetic statement when he said:

Far to the south, Mr. President, lies the richest and fairest domain of this earth. It

is the home of a brave and hospitable people, a fine climate, and fertile soil that yields to the husbandman every product of the temperate zone.

Appearing in the current issue of the American Legion magazine is a splendid article entitled "Our New Frontier Is Dixie." It is as follows:

OUR NEW FRONTIER IS DIXIE

(By Howard Stephenson)

(If it's oppor' nities you're looking for, go South, young man. There's a new spirit south of the Mason and Dixon's line, hard to explain but creating vast changes.)

Tobacco Road has been closed for repairs. The sharecropper and his family, who lived on black-eyed beans and sow-belly, and sat in rocking chairs in front of a rickety shanty, singing mournful hillbilly songs all the live-long day, would be hard to find in Dixie today.

On industrial missions, traveling from Miami to New Orleans, from Houston to Richmond, from Memphis to Atlanta and Asheville, this reporter has eye-witnessed a small part of a significant economic revolution.

You could call it evolution instead, but it has happened with such dramatic swiftness and on such a tremendous scale as to take your breath away.

Natchez, Miss., for example, a symbol of the Old South asleep in its memories, still is fragrant with magnolia blossoms. But it also has a \$20,000,000 rayon mill project, and two other \$3,000,000 factories, all post-war. You'll find similar fabulous developments right through the South. You'll also find it the land of opportunity for small-business ventures.

Birmingham is throwing down its iron glove to challenge Pittsburgh as the Nation's steel center. Long a big producer, it is not only building tremendous new capacity, but developing important research and technological projects. At Knoxville, Tenn., and Woodward, Ala., low-grade hematite ore is being put through new beneficiation processes to produce impressive output of pig-iron, and Alabama coal feeds the big steel hearths. Atlanta's steel industry also is up and coming with a big 3-year program of expansion and modernization. Southern steel capacity increase of 2,000,000 tons a year is under way.

This is attracting auto, electrical, and other fabricating plants on a huge scale. Last year the South set postwar records with \$841,000,000 worth of auto parts, \$447,000,000 airplanes, and 254,000,000 in ships, all big users of steel.

Impetus to this growth is promised by a revolutionary underground experiment being carried on at Gorgas, Ala., whereby coal is turned into fuel gas without being mined. The pattern of basic world industry could be changed by this research, originated by the Alabama Power Co. and the United States Bureau of Mines.

What has brought about the South's new industrial and agricultural revolution? It is rather obvious to point to the hard money pouring in at the rate of up to a billion a year, but that does show that American industry has at last moved to develop this long-neglected section.

The plants they're building are super-modern as a rule, comfortable to work in, air-conditioned, light-controlled, with the finest and most efficient machinery. The managements are instituting worker-training programs, recreational, hospitalization, and pension plans, and all the other social benefits of progressive industry elsewhere.

Down South when they say that money grows on trees, they mean it. Ten years ago southern newspapers were printed on Canadian newsprint paper. Now the South produces enough for its own needs and far beyond. The man primarily responsible was

the late Dr. Charles H. Herty. Working in a makeshift laboratory in Savannah, he discovered that harmful chemicals in southern pine were not present in freshly felled trees. This gave the clue to a giant new industry in the forests.

A committee of citizens of Talladega County, Ala., faced with the problems of converting excess war plants, studied the possibilities in pulp and paper production. A new \$32,000,000 mill at Coosa Pines, put into production in 1949, now turns out 300 tons of newsprint daily and provides 2,000 steady jobs. Other big paper plants are scheduled for Rome and Valdosta in Georgia, Yule, Perry, and Jacksonville, Fla.

Sawdust chemically treated to make animal food, perfume and synthetics from old stumps, wood waste turned into wall-board, a sawdust-mulched soil for gardening—these are some of the new wonders being developed from southern forests. Scientists have even discovered a way to make nature work faster in producing turpentine.

The industry, looking to its future, is planting 60,000,000 new trees a year.

While to southern industry the climate means little snow, low heating costs, and fewer absentee workers, to the farmer it means year-round crops, such as the Johnson grass that has supplanted cotton, and provides hay and grazing for sleek herds of fine cattle, with no drought seasons.

Southern cattle used to be scoffed at as bundles of hair, hide, hoofs, and horns, but not so today. There are 30,000,000 of them, as compared to 18,000,000 20 years ago, and while they've flourished, mechanized farming has pushed half the southern mules off the map.

Bovine population figures don't begin to tell the story of the improvement in southern beef cattle. This has been due to three major factors: Eradication of the cattle tick, fencing of the land, and better quality of herds. Florida, for example, is importing some 2,500 good bulls a year and now has over 1,000,000 beef cattle, with almost 600 registered herds, making that State the leader in the industry in the Southeast, and twelfth in the Nation. It brings in more than \$30,000,000 a year.

A cow that can sweat like a horse is the heroine of Dixie's new dairy industry, which bids fair to swing America's milk pail from the northern rim of States to the deep South. Crossbreeding of Brahma bulls from India with Guernseys and other standard strains results in a new kind of bossy, who moos like any other cow, gives generously of a rich butterfat-content milk, and doesn't droop in hot weather because she daintily perspires, which ordinary cows can't do.

Last year one dairy outfit alone bought 1,000,000 gallons of milk a week from southern farmers, from Florida to Louisiana, with no let-up in July and August, when most cows go on vacation. Demand for the air-conditioned milk cows is so strong that papa Brahma can't travel fast enough to accept all the invitations tendered to him. So artificial insemination is prevalent through the South; and the calf birth rate is beating all records.

Now southern scientists are developing a frozen milk concentrate that you can keep in the refrigerator like cans of frozen orange juice. If it works out, southern dairymen whoop, they'll take the national market like Lee took John Brown.

Meanwhile, milk consumption has soared throughout the South, which means healthier babies, and there's a rump roast on the table for Sunday dinner in homes where beef had never even been tasted.

Speaking of orange juice, the way Florida's citrus-fruit industry hit the jackpot is a classic of American enterprise in scientific research. Only a few years ago normal annual production of oranges exceeded

demand. Prices were low and you could buy a citrus grove for about the price of vacant land.

Then, according to H. M. Conway, Jr., director of the Southern Association of Science and Industry, "as a result of experiments conducted in the early 1940's, there was developed the method for canning and marketing the frozen concentrate which tastes just as good as the juice from fresh fruit. The method was first used in 1946. Public acceptance was instantaneous and production skyrocketed to over 25,000,000 gallons annually—the equivalent of more oranges than all Florida grew in 1929."

But neither climate nor money from outside can explain the South's new spirit. World War II marked the turning-point. Southern GI's had seen not only most parts of the world, but in particular most other parts of the United States of America. They were changed men, no longer to be satisfied with second best. When they came home, two ways were open to them—either to move elsewhere, or to make over their homeland.

Take one example of a southerner who decided to change his world. George McLean of Tupelo, Miss., discharged from the Navy in 1945, resumed his job as editor of the Daily Journal in his home town. He organized the Rural Community Development Council, operating in three counties. So far about 10,000 persons, in 16 white and 6 colored communities, have taken part in an extensive local development that has raised, and some say doubled, living standards.

No help was asked from Washington, thank you just the same. Local businessmen contribute \$30,000 a year. A wholesale grocer gives \$500, a furniture dealer the same, and so on. In 1 year 2,139 white families reported they had made improvements, such as terracing fields, painting houses, buying bred cattle, using artificial insemination for better livestock, etc.

Pastures are seeded in dallas grass, crimson clover, and lespedeza. These are cover crops, in contrast with the furrow crops which for over a century denuded southern soil and permitted erosion to rob it permanently of the food which plants need to live. Timber is cut selectively, to preserve woodlands. Farm homes are equipped with such things as water heaters and home freezer units. Now delegations are being sent from all over the map, as far away as Michigan and Cuba, to study the plan.

In North Carolina young blood in the post-war legislature brought about what is now called the schoolhouse revolution, a building program to the tune of \$50,000,000 in State funds, to which local communities have added \$75,000,000 of their own, in 1 year. Much obliged, Uncle, but these folks provide their own welfare state, and pay direct taxes, so they won't need Federal funds to educate the 300,000 children who'll have 10,000 new classrooms. Colored children, though segregated, get the same kind of buildings as white, and colored teachers average even higher pay.

Southern cities are impressive to the visitor familiar with their appearance 10 years or so ago. Main Street has had its face lifted, with new modern store fronts of porcelain enamel, glass, and plastics. Substantial steel, timber, and concrete frame buildings have replaced picturesque but tumbledown old structures. But it's in the countryside and in the small towns that the contrast shows most vividly.

There you see crews at work tearing down fences that used to hem in the tiny one-family patches of land where impoverished sharecroppers lived in huts and hovels, barely raising enough to feed their children. The shacks, many not fit for humans are likewise being demolished. This land is needed for cattle raising and diversified scientific farming.

Some of the men who used to live here work with the reconstruction crews. Others stay on the land, no longer on a starving "share" basis, but at respectable wages. Thousands of tenant farmers have moved into modern, prefabricated homes built mostly in small towns which have one or two industries.

This is the real, down-deep evidence of what is happening in Dixie. It's easier to understand than tables of statistics, though every village has its chamber of commerce or similar business-promotion agency, and the men who run those organizations will rattle off figures till you're dizzy.

The thing that hits you hardest, walking around the courthouse square of a typical southern town, is that the town itself seems to have come alive. Drop into the hardware store, for instance, on a Saturday morning. It's as brisk as a New York City bargain basement. Clerks don't slouch. Merchandise is arranged in open-display counters. One section of floor space is devoted to refrigerators, milk separators, kitchen ranges, and other gas and electric appliances. A home economist is demonstrating to a group of housewives an improved method of canning.

Out back, the old jumble of discarded junk and trash has been cleaned out. A factory representative is showing a dozen men and big boys in overalls how to use a small welding unit for machinery repairs.

This hardware store is a school, though neither teachers nor pupils think of it that way. The ex-share cropper and his wife are learning how to do things in a new way. Incidentally, the store has a dozen clerks instead of two or three. The new ones are recruited from farm families, trained on the job, and paid livable wages.

While you hear much about jobs in industry, of which there are hundreds available, it takes a personal visit to realize that some of the biggest opportunities in southern towns and cities are in retail and service businesses.

The three spick-and-span barber shops on the Court House Square are busy, just from the plain fact that menfolks don't cut their own hair any more. Sounds trivial, perhaps, but it means jobs. Just as important, it indicates a new self-respect, a new feeling of human dignity.

Women who had never entered a beauty shop in their lives become regular patrons, especially younger women. Many hold factory jobs, mingle with well-dressed folk at work, church, Legion dances, and social affairs. They want to belong.

They're not rich by any means, in fact the average worker and his wife have to watch the pennies pretty closely. Inflation is no more a stranger in the South than anywhere else in the United States. But just a decent, respectable mode of life is now possible to countless families who used to be referred to as "marginal."

What about those who stayed on the land? The South's farm income, for one thing, increased 26 percent in the past year alone. Farm workers got a share of that. A practical test of the prosperity of an agricultural area is the use of electricity. In North Carolina today only 2 farms in 10 are without electric power and in Georgia only 1 in 20. These electrified farms are what keeps the small towns so busy.

The typical southern town needs carpenters, brick masons, plumbers, plasterers, and other building tradesmen, too. Young professional men, such as lawyers, accountants, pharmacists, hotel managers, and engineers aren't finding it necessary to move to some big city for a profitable career. For example, 70 percent of recent Georgia Tech graduates are remaining in the South, and over half in the State.

And doctors, dentists, and nurses? There the picture isn't so bright, except from the standpoint of employment opportunities. The South has been depleted of much needed

medical care by the demands of military service. In some rural communities in Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi there is not one single medical man available near enough for emergency calls. Civic leaders of the South are hopeful of getting medical care on a par with the rest of America, but they're still far from the goal. One good sign is the 43 new hospitals included in North Carolina's building program, but other States desperately need similar projects.

The South has four main natural divisions, the coastal lands, the Piedmont plateau, the mountains and the Black Belt where cotton formerly was king. They call the Black Belt the middle South nowadays, and a combined promotional campaign carried on by Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas interests has had tremendous national impact. Oil and natural gas, together with rich timberlands and the fast-moving, meat-packing industry, are being developed.

It is in this region that the process for squeezing natural gas to yield gasoline and other liquids valuable in industry has made great strides in the past 5 years. There's lots of gas available, about 30,000,000,000 cubic feet of it. Over 350 communities in the 3 States are connected by a network of pipelines for home and industrial gas uses. Oil and chemical industries are building huge plants, tapping and transforming part of the 2,500,000,000 barrels of "black gold" reserves into useful products.

Alabama, with its important steel industry centering in Birmingham, is expanding into chemical and pulpwood industries. Stretching eastward from Birmingham to Virginia and the Carolinas, the rich Piedmont section is dotted with towns and villages where small factories, employing from 50 to a few hundred persons, are proving that there is room in the South for resourceful enterprise.

Gainesville, Ga., is the home of an industry of this type. It's the poultry center of the South, with an output of around \$60,000,000 a year. A prime mover in Gainesville's prosperity is Jesse D. Jewel, who turned a failing chickenfeed business into a "chicken dinner" factory and made a fortune. Chickens leave the Jewel plant in attractive boxes, ready to cook.

Another resourceful Georgian is Ed Stevens, who put his town of 3,800, Dawson, on the map. Stevens' claim to fame is the development of a better way to make peanut butter stick together. He went about it scientifically, by hiring the Southern Research Institute of Birmingham to experiment on the problem. Two years later they had the answer, and today Stevens' assembly line delivers two jars of homogenized peanut butter per second. He's the world's largest producer of the "goober goo"—and considers Dawson, Ga., the finest spot on earth. As it happens, Dawson is the home town of American Legion National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., himself an important figure in the Georgia industrial upsurge.

With \$1,000 cash and faith in an idea, William Wilkerson, of Atlanta, gave still another demonstration of Dixie ingenuity. He was told by a cobbler that the shoe business needed a machine that would drive nails automatically. Not being an inventor himself, Wilkerson hunted up a machinist friend, J. L. Moore, and worked with him through one failure after another. What they didn't know was that the shoe industry's best researchers had been beating their brains on the same problem for years. Not being aware of the impossibility of the idea, the two men toiled for nearly 2 years—then they had it. They later applied the same principle to a furniture and toy nailer, thus opening a much enlarged national market.

All over the Southland, men like Wilkerson, Stevens and Jewel are applying the principles of courage and resourcefulness to small

business enterprises. Their total volume may not stack up with the billion-dollar concerns, but there are a lot of them and they have found in the South financial independence, a new spirit of encouragement—and oh, yes, that climate!

ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the majority leader may I say that the first order of business on the program for tomorrow will be consideration of House Resolution 414. That is the Latham resolution as amended and relates to a further study of tax over-lapping by the House Committee on Ways and Means.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANHAM (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] is recognized for 45 minutes.

(Mr. HARRISON of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

FRAUD AND WASTE IN PUBLIC WELFARE PROGRAMS

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the taxpayers want to know one of the reasons it is necessary to increase their income and withholding taxes they should take a look at the inefficiency, the waste, and the fraud in the public-welfare program.

In speaking of public welfare and relief, I do not refer to payments made under the old-age or unemployment insurance. I have reference only to direct payments for which the recipient has made no contributions whatever; direct payments under the aid for dependent children program, aid to the blind, the old-age assistance program and general relief.

Every good citizen wants to pay his share for aid to the destitute who are unable to work for their own support. But today large sums are being paid to shameless cheats and for extravagant, inefficient, and socialistic administration.

Money deducted from your pay checks—

Says the Saturday Evening Post—

goes to cheats, encourages them to avoid work and you're not even allowed to know who they are.

Let no one say that criticism of these conditions is an attack upon the unfortunate destitute. Money paid to chislers not only is money stolen from the man who by honest toil pays the taxes, it is also money stolen from those actually in need.

The taxpayer pays about half this bill through the Federal Government and

the other half through his local and State government.

During the fiscal year 1939-40, before the wartime boom, relief for those items which I have mentioned under the heading of relief and public welfare cost about \$1,000,000,000. In the current fiscal year, relief will cost about \$3,000,000,000.

In 1939-40 the Federal Government contributed to the support of 2,036,000 persons, but in these times of labor shortages and high demand for work, the number of alleged destitute receiving Government checks in 1950 was 2,809,000, an increase of over 40 percent.

In 1939-40, the old-age insurance program was in its infancy and as a result not many old people were entitled to the benefits of that law.

Hence, it would be reasonable to assume that after 10 additional years under old-age insurance the cost of direct aid to the destitute aged would be decreased. On the contrary, the cost of old-age assistance increased from \$475,000,000 in 1939-40 to \$1,485,000,000 in 1949-50. During the same period the cost of aid to dependent children went up from \$130,000,000 to \$556,000,000.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. Is it not a fact that the amount of contributions by the Federal Government both to the recipients of old-age assistance benefits and the aid to dependent children has been raised by this Congress almost twofold?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. It has been raised, but just exactly how much I do not know.

Mr. CAMP. Would not that account for the increase in the amounts paid to the recipients?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No. It has been raised from \$130,000,000 to \$556,000,000.

Mr. CAMP. I contend that we have just been reaching the dependents, the children, in the last 6 years.

The amount the country is paying has increased and those increases are largely due to the fact that the Congress has raised the amounts. There are now several States paying the maximum of \$75 per month for old-age assistance.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The gentleman will recall that I just stated that the number on relief has gone up in that period from 2,066,000 to 2,809,000, after 15 years operation of the old-age insurance program, under which many millions of persons have been able to come under that insurance program who were not there in the period 1939-40. It seems to me those figures answer the gentleman's contention that the increased cost comes as a result of increased appropriations.

Mr. CAMP. I think upon examination the gentleman will find that in the beginning of the program many of the States had not entered the public-assistance program and were then paying small amounts, and to a very small percentage of those who normally might be entitled to receive it.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. For that reason I did not select figures at the beginning of the program, I selected figures in 1940, after the program had been in operation some years. I readily agree with the gentleman that it is costing more today.

Mr. CAMP. The increase is not because people are on the rolls who are not entitled to be there, it is because the program is based on need. If there are people on the rolls who are not entitled to be there, the cheats and chiselers of whom the gentleman spoke, it is the fault of the local authorities who placed them there.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. It is the fault of the laws of this Congress that leave the names of the chiselers and cheats under secrecy and concealment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House of Representatives. I do not know whether or not it is generally known, but my State of Indiana in the last session of the legislature undertook to deal with this problem, and particularly with that phase of it which has to do with the secrecy involved in the disclosure, or rather, regulations against the disclosure of the names of recipients. I will comment on that a little later if the gentleman will permit me, further on in his speech. However, at this point, and apropos of what he has said and apropos of the apparent challenge issued by the gentleman from Georgia that all of the increases in the rolls in the amount over all expended, referred to by the gentleman from Virginia, can be found in the action of the Congress increasing the amounts, let me say that the action of the Legislature of the State of Indiana in the direction of making a very limited and restricted disclosure has in many counties in our State already resulted in substantial reductions in the amounts paid under the operations of the act. I mention that fact because it would seem to bear out what the gentleman from Virginia is talking about.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that testimony before the Committee on Appropriations by people in the Federal Security Agency shows that, in 1941, 600,000 children were subject to ADC help, and this year they have testified that the list has grown to 1,600,000 children, which, of course, is an increase of more than three times in 10 years. That accounts for most of the increase in the amount of money appropriated.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I think that is correct. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Georgia has said that if there was fraud and corruption, it ought to be exposed. Let us take a

look at official investigations made in some of the States.

In the State of Michigan, there were 19 official investigations of relief scandals within a 2-year period. Officials who headed these inquiries said that 35 percent of relief recipients were cheaters and that there were administrative failures in 87 percent of the cases. In March 1949, 245,000 persons, approximately 4 percent of the entire population of the State, were drawing relief money. One welfare worker resigned in disgust because he said 50 percent of the recipients were cheating.

Seven "career" welfare cases in Detroit have cost taxpayers \$230,000.

During a period when he was arrested 17 times and convicted 8 times, one man received \$70,000 for relief for himself and family. That is right, \$70,000.

I became much interested in following the career of a woman who, without physical disability or dependent children, at the age of 42, had drawn \$50,000 in relief money. As a side line, she was engaged in the policy numbers racket. The official records show that welfare case workers knew of this activity and protected her from police detection.

Public welfare officials bought shoes for her with public money at \$16 a pair. Her relief checks were delivered to her in publicly owned cars at her hotel where she was maintained by the taxpayers. She bought and sold real estate, and at one time the taxpayers paid her rent, for permitting her to live in her own quarters. She took expensive vacations, and, on one occasion, the welfare department paid her way home to Detroit from Los Angeles, Calif.

The lady owned four evening gowns and two fur coats. About fur coats the Detroit public welfare commissioner said:

Sure we know women wearing mink coats are getting free medical attention * * *. So what? Maybe somebody gave them these coats. Besides they've got to wear some kind of coats and what difference does it make what kind they wear.

Under the Federal statute requiring secrecy the lady's name has never been published.

About her case, the commissioner of public welfare of Detroit explains:

She created so much disturbance that she got what she wanted anyway.

A snake-loving fortune teller in a Detroit saloon drew relief for 3 years as a supplement to the \$9 a day paid her for 4 hours appearance in the saloon.

A number of persons drawing relief had outside incomes in excess of \$400 a month. Some had high-paying jobs including positions as dance promoters, bartenders, and interior decorators. Free hospital bills were paid for one who had \$28,000 in the bank. Another with an income of \$508 a month drew \$140 a month from the taxpayers. A 33-year-old divorcee, who earned \$45 a week as a beautician, in addition to receiving \$50 a month alimony, was kept on the public dole for 7 years. At the end of that time she said she had

made so much money she was going into business for herself.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I understand that some of the facts that the gentleman is relating as to what occurred in the State of Michigan have been published twice in the Saturday Evening Post; is that correct?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. There has been an article in the Saturday Evening Post about conditions in Michigan; yes, but I have not read it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I understand also that the State of Michigan, part of the time these events were occurring, had a Democratic governor, and part of the time it had a Republican governor, but that during all of the period of time that this was happening, both branches of the State government were Republican. Does the gentleman know about that?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I am not informed on that.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I want to compliment the gentleman for rendering a great public service in bringing this matter to the attention of the House of Representatives. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to say further that this is a matter which has given great concern to the people of my home State of Georgia. I call attention to the fact that the General Assembly of the State of Georgia in session this year on the 7th day of February, adopted a resolution calling attention to the fact that this inordinate secrecy has proved to be a hindrance to the proper and just administration of the social security laws, and it adopted a resolution calling for the repeal of this secrecy provision.

Also, the Fulton County Grand Jurors Association in Atlanta in Fulton County, Ga., which is a continuing body of members who formerly served on the grand jury of that county adopted a resolution calling for modification of this secrecy provision. The Atlanta Constitution on June 14 of this year had an editorial strongly calling for the opening up of welfare rolls for inspection to prevent just the thing that the gentleman has been calling to our attention. Also, the Fulton County grand jurors, separate and apart from the Fulton County Grand Jurors Association, at the May-June term this year, 1951, adopted a resolution in which they say among other things:

We notice with pleasure that there is legislation pending in the National Congress which, if enacted into law, would permit States to pass legislation defining conditions under which relief rolls might be made public to grand juries, agencies of the Government and other properly interested parties without penalty from the national Government.

And they adopted a resolution calling for modification of the law.

I should like also to call attention to the fact that the De Kalb County grand jury—which is my home county—last year, 1950, adopted resolutions bearing upon this subject; and again in January

1951, they adopted resolutions bearing on this subject and calling attention to the very things which the gentleman is talking about here today.

With the gentleman's permission, I shall later ask unanimous consent to insert these documents in the Record at the conclusion of his speech.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I should be glad to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly at that point?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Davis] has pointed out the fact that many of these things have gone on under Democratic and Republican administrations. I commend him for that observation, because it evidences a fact which should be obvious to all of us, which is that this problem is not a political one but rather one of over-all protection of the national interest.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield briefly.

Mr. CAMP. I am afraid that possibly the gentleman may feel that I challenged him on this proposition perhaps from the tone of my question, but I believe that it is absolutely necessary that these rolls be inspected, and I favor the grand jury's doing it and the prosecuting attorney's doing it. I think the law should be amended to permit that. That was what I was leading up to a moment ago.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I must confess that in my judgment I am afraid that is not adequate to meet the problem.

One man on relief had a \$4,000 boat. When a case worker suggested that this particular individual be dropped from public assistance, he said his supervisor told him:

The trouble with you is that you are frustrated. You don't own a speedboat, and your frustration proves itself by your jealousy of this man who does. He has been accustomed to operating his boat and should be allowed to continue.

Many recipients of relief drove big, late-modeled automobiles. One of them was a woman with a \$3,000 Lincoln, and a television set given her by her paramour. The public-welfare worker who investigated the Lincoln made an official notation about it as follows:

She said it was very difficult for her to get around the city on streetcars with small children. We shared these feelings with her.

To another lady, the taxpayers gave \$25 a week for 3 years for the employment of a maid. This item was carried on the books of the welfare department as an allowance for "business expense."

The assistant manager of the welfare office explained it this way:

That really shouldn't be called business expense. The \$50 every 2 weeks pays for a maid who does all the cooking, washing, ironing, and house cleaning.

After these facts were brought to light the maid lost her job. But the public-

welfare department took care of that. They put her on relief.

This same family conducted a radio-repair shop. Unfortunately, the business was unprofitable, so the public-welfare department for 3 years made up the losses with taxpayers' money. The president of the welfare commission said he heartily endorsed the principle of subsidizing businesses with welfare funds.

Another Detroit lady could not work because of high blood pressure. But with what a witness described as "a roll of greenbacks that would choke the proverbial horse," she frequently attended and bet on the horse races. At the races she was joined by a welfare worker. It was reported that when the horses came down the stretch the woman let her blood pressure soar and joined in the clamor.

Giving a fictitious name and address, a newspaper reporter applied for hospital treatment at public expense. No investigation was made as to either his name or his address, nor was he asked even as to his ability to pay. He was treated, along with some 50 others, many of whom drove up in taxicabs or their own automobiles. He claimed his feet were sore and received free X-rays, not only of his feet, but, over his protest, of the rest of his anatomy. The X-rays revealed that there was nothing wrong with him. Nevertheless, he was still given free treatment and free medicine and told to report in the future for more.

The reforms forced after these revelations have saved \$5,000,000 in the cost of relief in Michigan but the attitude of the public welfare officials in that State has not changed. At an enthusiastic meeting, public welfare workers were told to ignore the findings of the investigations. "Food," claimed one lady, "is almost as much of a social aid as it is used for survival. Thus, having the means to serve tea or cake is important for the welfare client.

"Clothing must be of a quality and style which will make the client socially acceptable.

"There must be money for recreational needs" and "to save for a rainy day."

In the opinion of those responsible for the investigation in Michigan, the root of these evils is the Federal law requiring secrecy. The public investigations in Michigan came after exposures made by Fred Tew of the Detroit Free Press, who, as a result of years of relentless inquiry and constant prodding is completely familiar with the operation of the public welfare program in Michigan.

With reference to the secrecy provisions of the Federal Law, Mr. Tew has written me as follows:

A reading of the stories will prove conclusively, I believe, that social workers and welfare administrators have used the confidentiality of the records as a shield for their own malpractice. * * *

Never once in the 3 years of Detroit welfare probes have social workers been able to bring forth a single recipient who has been rehabilitated as a result of social work techniques. Instead, there have been numerous instances in which the Free Press has been able to show how coddling by social workers has ruined the characters of many

persons to such an extent that they are content to live off the taxpayers' labors. I submit, very seriously, that this ever-increasing number of dependents is endangering democracy. * * *

The Free Press has maintained that welfare records are public property by virtue of the fact the records are compiled by public servants who spend public funds in giving aid to persons supposedly in need. The Free Press has not been granted permission to study the records directly, but, as you will learn from the clippings, was able to obtain, by various methods, some of these public records.

Repeated editorials in the Free Press have concurred in the conclusion that the repeal of the secrecy provision is essential if we wish to end the stealing of public money in the relief program.

In Illinois an investigation made by a citizens committee on the demand of the Chicago Daily News has revealed similar conditions.

In January 1951 it was shown that 1 out of 15 cases on the Illinois relief roll was a definite fraud. In some areas 60 percent of those receiving aid were ineligible. The cost of the relief program in Illinois is \$125,000,000 a year, and the grand total since the program started a number of years ago exceeds \$2,000,000,000.

Chiseling and fraud were shown to exist in Illinois though the investigation revealed that the Illinois Public Welfare Commission had endeavored as best it could to curb and expose dishonesty. The investigation established that secrecy required by Federal and State law was responsible for conditions. The State of Illinois has since repealed its secrecy provisions.

In a study of 165 suspect cases where women claimed public support for their children on the ground that the father was missing the investigation revealed that the "missing father" was found in over 90 percent of the cases and that of these 40 percent were fathers of illegitimate children. The taxpayers' bill in Illinois for missing fathers is \$1,435,000 a month.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman referred to the action of the State of Illinois in respect to the secrecy provisions. I may point out that the Legislature of Illinois hinged that law upon repeal or change in the secrecy provisions of the Federal law.

If the gentleman will permit at this time, I wonder if it might not be helpful, in connection with the very enlightening statement that he is making, for me to make some comment, in view of his reference to Illinois, to our present situation in Indiana.

First of all, it should be pointed out in connection with the opening of this matter that the amendment referred to as the so-called secrecy clause was adopted in 1939 in these words:

That the State plans must, effective July 1, 1941, provide safeguards which restrict the use of disclosure of the information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of old-age assistance.

Let me say at this point that I made a speech for the Social Security Act in 1935 and voted for it, so no one can challenge my solicitude for the fine elderly people of this country who are deserving of old-age assistance. As frequently happens, we have reports in connection with legislation that indicate what the Congress intended.

Here is another classic illustration of administrative decision that has nothing to do with legislative intent because, in the report filed, the committee said this:

In respect to provisions for administration (2), provision is made to restrict the use of information concerning recipients of old-age assistance (particularly their names and addresses) to purposes directly connected with the administration of old-age assistance. This is designed to prevent the use of such information for political and commercial purposes.

If the gentleman will permit, notice the study of the debates of 1935, under which this act was created, I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina, who took a leading part in those debates. This study emphasized time and again that the administration of these programs was primarily a State responsibility, that the States had the primary responsibility for determining the program and administering it, and it was said that the principal participation of the Federal Government was to be in the grant-in-aid.

Under that language, the State of Indiana, my State, as have other States, decided that they ought to do something to bring about a more effective and more efficient administration of these various programs, so my State enacted this legislation. I want it to be measured in the light of Mr. Ewing's ruling, which undertakes to take away from my State \$22,000,000 to which we are entitled. I am afraid if we are to recover it we are going to have to get our relief here in the Congress of the United States.

This is what our law said, and I challenge anyone, Mr. Ewing notwithstanding, to say that it is in contravention of the Federal law:

The county welfare board of each county shall on or before the 30th day of each January, April, July, and October, file with the county auditor, each member of the county council, prosecuting attorney, and all township trustees of such county a complete report showing the names and addresses of all recipients receiving (welfare) payments together with the amounts paid to each during the preceding quarter.

The reports so filed with the county auditor shall be securely bound by him in a separate record book provided for that purpose * * * and shall be declared to be public records and shall be open to public inspection at all times during the regular office hours.

Then this is added:

It shall be unlawful for any person, body, association, firm, corporation, or other agency to solicit, disclose, receive, make use of, or to acquiesce in the use of, any lists or names for commercial or political purposes of any nature, or for any purpose not directly connected with the administration of public assistance.

Violation of the law carries a penalty of \$25 to \$1,000, to which may be added jail terms not exceeding 60 days.

Is not that complete protection against misuse of the information for political or commercial purposes? Yet Mr. Ewing argued around it. He said it was no safeguard. Is it not a safeguard that a man may be put in jail for doing something that the Congress says they did not want done by reason of the language they wrote?

I say that wholly apart from the point upon which the gentleman has already touched are two great major problems: First, what is the right of the States of this Union? Have they any rights left? They are putting in a big part of this money.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. They are putting in half of it.

Mr. HALLECK. They are putting in half of it, and the part the Federal Government is putting in, in aid, first comes from the gentleman's State and my State, as well as the other States.

Secondly, are we to sit by and let a bureaucratic ruling, which I say is erroneous, deprive your State or my State of the money to which it is justly entitled?

It is my understanding that the Committee on Ways and Means is going to give consideration to a measure similar to the one introduced by the gentleman from Virginia, either one introduced by Mr. BROWNSON from my State, or one introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. I hope this will be done in the very near future, so that we can go into this matter. Whatever may have been the motives of the Congress in 1938, I think it is high time that we recognize the situation as it exists today and move to make it possible for the States to meet the responsibilities that were originally imposed upon them in the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Since my State of Illinois has been discussed, I should like to point out a similar experience I had last December when I went up to the county court of Cook County to sit during a period of 2 weeks.

I do not believe any of us are of a mind to deprive anybody who is legitimately entitled to old-age assistance, or mothers who have dependent children, or people who are entitled to unemployment compensation. However, in just 1 day while I sat in that court there were 31 people brought in for violation of this law, 31 people in one county.

I understand from talking to many of the other down-State judges who sat in Cook County, which is Chicago, that they had had that many on many other days.

At that time I questioned the assistant State's attorney of Cook County and some of these people who have been prosecuting these cases as to why more vigorous action was not taken. In many of them return of the money was sufficient and nothing was done. There were no prosecutions entered.

I found the set-up to be that in many cases of compensation the people came in, 400, 500, or 600 a day, and they had three or four tables. The people lined

up and they went down the line. The interrogator asked them if they had been unemployed last week. You pulled a card out and you signed it. There was no interrogation about the facts or what the circumstances were back of whether or not that man had been employed, what he had been doing during the intervening time, or whether he had made any attempt to find employment, nor was there any attempt made to place that man in vacancies that did exist in Cook County that could have been supplied through the Federal employment office. That is in the second largest city in this country. I give you a picture of that because I think it does back up what the gentleman has said in a different field, but I think it is an analogous case.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Those conditions exist in a State where official investigations have shown that the public welfare commission has not done anything to cause the situation. Secrecy is the basis of it, despite whether it is well run or not. Secrecy is the difficulty, the means by which fraud is accomplished.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that Illinois has passed such a law as this in the last session of the legislature, and they have put the escape clause in so that if such a law is enacted by the Federal Government immediately there will be a repeal of the secrecy provisions as far as Illinois is concerned. That is the only difference between Illinois and Indiana.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. With the birth of every illegitimate child in Illinois, \$93.87 is taken from the pockets of the taxpayers.

In some cases, illegitimate children carried on the dole as dependent were also receiving public aid for their own illegitimate children.

The wealthiest suburbs of Chicago are clipping the taxpayers for relief to the tune of \$500,000 a year. One suburbanite drove up in a Cadillac for free dental care. But the names of these well-heeled recipients cannot be made known because the Federal law forbids.

In peculiar contrast to this silk-stock- ing raid on the fund for the destitute, is the revelation that the Communists have been fishing in the same troubled waters. In Cook County, two-thirds of the case workers are members of a union expelled by the CIO because of Communist domination. These members of the United Public Workers vigorously opposed all fraud investigations and fought a case review program set up to keep chiselers off the rolls. One supervisor, a member of the union, was charged with the deliberate use of his public position to retard the investigation.

Two thousand Chicago relief workers are political appointees.

What do the investigators in Illinois assign as the reason for dishonesty in public welfare in that State?

The Chicago Daily News which led the fight for an investigation said:

The glaring weakness of the law is the requirement of secrecy concerning the beneficiary. * * *

Repeal of the Federal law and regulations requiring secrecy on the part of the State is

necessary to prevent relief from overwhelmingly the budget even in times of relative prosperity.

Within 2 years at the present rate of spending, public welfare in Oklahoma is estimated will cost the taxpayers more than \$150,000,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is nothing. We have one little county in the Fourth Congressional District, St. Joseph County, and it amounts to \$3,000,000 there.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I would not claim that any part of the country could keep up with the gentleman's district.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When we do things, we do them in a big way once we get started.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. In an illuminating article in the September 8 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, Paul Molley tells about the corruption of the aid for dependent children in the State of Oklahoma. According to the Post article, which was reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A5635, an investigation conducted by the Tulsa Tribune has uncovered that relief money is being paid to 8 percent of all the children in the State, some 55,000 of them. Much of this is handed over to, and used by, lazy and improvident parents, well able to work for the maintenance of themselves and their children.

It was shown that criminals are among the men, and prostitutes among the women, being paid under a program set up for dependent children. At the present time, aid for dependent children in Oklahoma is costing \$14,326,000.99, of which, all but \$4,968,459 is paid by the Federal Government.

Within 2 years, at the present rate of spending, public welfare in Oklahoma, it is estimated, will have cost the taxpayers more than \$150,000,000.

Mr. Molley further reports:

In case after case the investigation showed that the father is a chiseler and the mother a drone. Caught in between is the citizen paying the bill for the lazy, apathetic, ne'er-do-wells satisfied to eat the bread of idleness. * * *

The cases of rapacity and fraud are endless.

Why do these conditions exist in Oklahoma?

The editor of the newspaper which conducted the investigation gives the answer:

The reason why the ADC program went sour is the secrecy that surrounds the payments. * * * This * * * encourages leeches to live off the wage earner because their identity is protected. Thus we have made the matter of getting relief so easy that we are creating a large class of professional paupers. As long as the records remain hidden and the citizen tapped for taxes cannot learn whether his neighbor has a hand in his pocket, laziness and promiscuity will continue profitable and attractive.

Investigations in other States, notably Tennessee and Indiana, have uncovered

the same shocking conditions as in Oklahoma, Michigan, and Illinois.

In one agricultural county in Tennessee the officials defied the Federal law and published the names of chiselers on their rolls. Many of them were close relatives of prosperous citizens. Some of the wealthiest were shown to be willing to shift to the State the burden of caring for the needy in their family, some of whom got that way by transferring their property.

The most intriguing case in Tennessee was the squirrel hunter who collected \$214 a month under the program for the aid to the blind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The gentleman from Indiana made reference to the contention that repealing the secrecy provisions of the law would subject the persons on the relief rolls to political coercion. I do not know where Mr. Ewing got that argument. If anybody appeals to them more than he does, I would like to know who it is. I do not think anyone is completely exempt from that. You turn on the radio and listen to Democrats and Republicans running for office. They always say, "Elect me and the relief rolls will be bigger." They do not put it in exactly those words, but that is what they are saying.

What difference does it make if they know the names or not? The man on relief knows whether he is on relief, and he decides between the candidates vying and contesting between themselves as to which one of them is going to give him the most money.

If there is any advantage in knowing the names, I think it would reduce political coercion if they were published because today the politicians and public officials not only have access to the relief rolls, but they are the only people who do have such access. Therefore, this security protects political manipulation, but public access to the names will expose such manipulation where it now exists.

It is also contended that publicity would cause shame and humiliation to those who are receiving aid. The only persons who will be really shamed are those who are receiving public charity without need. Well was it said by the Chicago Daily News that "a return to the days when every man valued his independence, and was reluctant to accept help except in direst need, is not to be feared, but welcomed."

These contentions are answered in a well-reasoned editorial in yesterday's issue of the Washington Sunday Star, wherein it is concluded:

There is another principle at stake which is more important than any of these suppositions. That is the right of the people to know how relief money is being spent and to whom it is being paid. For it is the peo-

ple who put up this money. It is their own money. It should be contrary to sound public policy to clothe in secrecy the expenditure of huge sums in public funds, paid out to support citizens.

Secret and concealed expenditure of public money desecrates a basic principle of democratic government. The principle of government by the people is in fundamental conflict with a policy that permits officeholders to levy huge taxes and spend the money in secrecy and concealment.

When the framers of our Constitution met in Philadelphia they made it clear that Congress should have no powers except those delegated in the Constitution itself.

But there were some powers, the exercise of which, the founding fathers thought so dangerous to the liberties of the people that they were not content to simply fail to delegate them and say no more. As to these powers the framers of our Constitution spelt out positive prohibitions against their exercise and section 9 of article 1 enumerates 10 things which Congress expressly may not do.

The seventh of these positive restrictions upon the power of Congress is that—

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

How can we defend naked disobedience of this positive constitutional mandate?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield.
Mr. HALLECK. I wish to say again, if I may, that this matter is a very critical one in my State, Indiana. It is critical today. Measures to deal with this problem are before the Ways and Means Committee. I sincerely hope that action can be had there in the very near future, and by that I mean the immediate future, because, this is not an academic question with us; it is a real one. The House of Representatives should pass upon this very important matter.

Further in that connection, measures dealing with this very problem have twice been submitted to a record vote in the other body and twice by very substantial majorities have been carried. My own view is that if the great Committee on Ways and Means should give us an opportunity to pass upon this matter the House of Representatives would take similar action in the light of the condition that exists today.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. GRANGER rose.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia first because he is older than I will yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I deny the allegation and defy the allegator.

I wish to compliment the gentleman from Virginia, my good colleague, on his

courage and on the clearness with which he has presented this matter and the fact that he has brought this scandal to the official attention of the House of Representatives as a whole.

I do want to express myself as very strongly in favor of this bill and express the hope that the Ways and Means Committee will no longer keep it in a pigeon hole but will bring it out and tell this membership to stand up and be counted on whether we are for or against this type of scandalous fraud in the distribution of public funds.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Virginia and now yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Would the gentleman care to say who made these investigations he has referred to?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes; in Oklahoma they were made, as I understand, under the auspices of the private investigation of the Tulsa Tribune. In Michigan they were made by a senate committee of the State legislature and by a committee set up by the city council of the city of Detroit and by the auditor of the city of Detroit who was authorized and directed to do so by the council. In the State of Illinois they were made by a citizens' committee which was appointed officially. They were given access to the records.

Mr. GRANGER. The only thing I have in mind is to keep the record straight. Since the gentleman started speaking I overheard a conversation among the Members here to the effect that this was perhaps a report that was given to the Ways and Means Committee by our staff.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Oh, no. Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and it should be made clear that this information has never been determined by the Ways and Means Committee or its staff.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I have had the information that I could have given to the Ways and Means Committee on a number of occasions.

Mr. GRANGER. But they have not taken any of it; that is what I am trying to bring out.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. GRANGER. And so far as the committee is concerned it is not in possession of the information the gentleman has been giving the House here this afternoon.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. That is not my fault.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Would not the gentleman from Virginia also agree that if we have to publish the list of the so-called paupers we should also publish the list of large corporations who are getting tax refunds?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I would think that we should publish the names of anybody who is stealing money from the Federal Government, whether rich or poor.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The salaries that are paid us are a matter of record. Why, the pay we give our clerks in our offices is open to public inspection in the office of the Clerk of the House. Not so long ago we passed a law requiring every person undertaking to influence legislation to come in and file a report as to what he gets and what he does with it. That runs through our whole system.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE. I want to congratulate the gentleman on this long overdue exposure and statement. I am not bragging of Oklahoma in this instance, for if you will look in the RECORD of yesterday you will see where I am apologizing and insisting upon a change in conditions. May I suggest that prior to the enactment of this legislation by the Congress involving the secrecy clause, we had relief roles in our locality. The recipients and the amounts they received were published in almost every county of this land and by the laws of the State monthly. There is no more harm in publishing what comes from the Government and the States than there is in publishing items from the county treasury.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think that failure to publish, failure to give an account is disobedience of the Constitution?

Mr. SCHWABE. There is no question about that.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. First, I think it ought to be pointed out that since this so-called secrecy clause was written in the law in 1938 we have come a long way in a realization of the necessity and desirability of old-age assistance. I do not know of anyone who now says that some such program must not be in effect. Since we did write that provision in the law, is this not finally a determination that the Congress ought to make? The States enacted State laws, as did my State, in compliance with this mandate of the Federal Congress. All that we are required to pass upon is this very simple question: Shall we say to the States, which have the primary responsibility for administering these funds: if you want to do it, if you determine that you can better handle the program without offense to anyone who is really entitled to the money, to make some limited disclosure, then you should have the right to do it.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, a violation of this constitutional principle, the principle of sound government, becomes much more dangerous when the secret and concealed spending of billions of dollars a year is entrusted to a bureaucratic monstrosity headed by Oscar Ewing, who openly espouses total Government control of social welfare and public health. We need not speculate on the future. Behind an iron curtain of secrecy and concealment we have today a miniature welfare state in actual operation, a welfare state that spends public money for luxuries for the undeserving and for the financing and encouragement of improvidence and illegitimacy. The cornerstone of this miniature welfare state is secrecy and concealment.

As the gentleman from Indiana has pointed out, twice the United States Senate has voted to put an end to the secrecy and concealment clause and I am confident that the House will do likewise when given an opportunity to vote thereon.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Speaking of publicity and secrecy, I want to heartily endorse what the gentleman has said on this important subject. I do not think that there is any bona fide deserving person or any recipient now on the relief rolls that would fear honest publicity. On the other hand, these crooks, these frauds, these cheats that the gentleman has exposed ought not to be given the protection of secrecy. The taxpayer is entitled to know whether the public money is being spent honestly, fairly and wisely. Money bled from this fund in the manner described by the gentleman from Virginia is actually being stolen from our aged, blind and needy. What could be worse?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The chislers are the people who would be shamed by publicity.

Mr. CHELF. I want to also endorse what the gentleman from Indiana has said. Times have changed and in my opinion it is not a disgrace, if one through no fault of their own is receiving legitimate assistance from his fellowman. I do not believe any Member on this floor would deny to any poor old needy person in the sunset trail of life—food, clothing, shelter and medical attention. Fact of the matter, and I now want to go on record, that I am for raising the present allotments to those who actually are in destitute and in indigent circumstances—but in order to be able to do that we must, through necessity stop these leaks in the present system. We must weed out those leeches who are trying to wreck the program. I hope and pray that the gentleman's revelation today will bring action. This really makes sense to me. I did not know that these glaring violations were going on. Oh, I had heard rumors of course, but no concrete facts or evidence such as has been brought out here today. I am proud that the gentleman has made this speech. I hope the great Ways and Means Committee will come in with

something here before we adjourn. We should not go home before this has been gone into fully and completely. Action is needed now. I want to go home as bad as anybody here but I do not want to go until we get this job done. This thing is costing the taxpayers of this country billions of dollars. This wholesale stealing from the taxpayers and the poor deserving people of the Nation must stop and now is the time and this is the place to do it. It is inconceivable that a person could stoop so low as to steal from the funds allocated by the Congress to our deserving needy blind, aged and destitute people.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his personal observation and I point out to the gentleman that the taxpayers' money could be saved, and at the same time those who are actually in need could better be taken care of were it not for money paid to these cheaters because of secrecy and concealment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. I want to commend the gentleman for his presentation. I may say from what we have found in Indiana that the shame will not rest on the brows of the older people. We have found in Indiana that much of the shame will rest on the heads of those in the welfare department who are deliberately collecting their charges in order to build their empire. From an examination of people who have dropped off the rolls since our Antisecrecy Act was passed, we have discovered that these people in a vast majority of the cases did not falsify any information on the application blank at all. They were absolutely guiltless in themselves, but the public-welfare authorities, knowing full well on the face of the matter that they had no right on the relief rolls at all, put them on the rolls deliberately, contrary to law, because they could hide behind the veil of secrecy.

I do not believe you are going to shame any old people at all. The gentleman does not want to and none of the rest of us does. But I think the gentleman is going to surprise some empire-building welfare workers from one end of the country to the other when his bill is passed, as it should be.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I am not going to debate it on that ground. I do not think you will shame them, either. But this bill ought to pass because of the principle of government involved, that is, that the people who pay this money are entitled to know where it is going.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, as stated by the gentleman from Kentucky, it is my earnest contention that the secret

spending of billions for public welfare should be ended before this Congress adjourns.

At this session the Congress is imposing the most crushing tax burden ever placed on the backs of the American people. In simple justice to those we are compelling to pay this bill, the least we can do is to plug up every means through which the people's money is wasted, or stolen, or frittered away. Such being true, if we are to maintain public confidence in Congress, we should not—we must not—go home and leave an extravagant and radical bureaucracy spending billions in secrecy, especially when we know that such secret spending is accompanied by waste and fraud.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us or hazard a guess as to what he thinks the chances are of getting this legislation out of the Committee on Ways and Means and before the House before adjournment?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I think they are pretty good.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to commend the gentleman on his statement. It has been a burning issue in the State of Florida for some time. One of the great daily newspapers of the South, the Tampa, Fla., Tribune, has been advocating what the gentleman has brought out here today for several months.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I understand there were some exposures in Florida that showed similar conditions.

Mr. McMULLEN. The State Legislature of Florida passed a law doing away with secrecy of the relief rolls. The Governor vetoed it for fear the State of Florida would find itself in the position in which the State of Indiana now finds itself.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The question is whether or not Mr. Ewing or this Congress shall control the expenditure of public money.

FRAUD AND WASTE IN PUBLIC WELFARE PROGRAMS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the very fine presentation which has just been made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] I referred to certain resolutions, editorials, and other matter which I then stated would later ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of his speech.

In support of the position taken by the gentleman from Virginia and in support of the appeal which he has made, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Georgia on February 7 in the Senate and on February 15 in the House; a resolution adopted by the grand jury of Fulton County at the May-June term, 1951; an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Constitution on Thursday, June 14, 1951, entitled "Open the Welfare Rolls"; a resolution adopted by the Fulton County Grand Jury Association, not dated, but signed by Eugene Young, secretary; a copy of a resolution adopted by the De Kalb County, Ga., grand jury on Au-

gust 21, 1950; and an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Journal on January 29, 1951, entitled "De Kalb Grand Jury's Findings on Relief."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The documents referred to follow:

RESOLUTION

Whereas certain statutory laws of the Federal Government require the various States to hold confidential the names of, and other information concerning, those persons who are the recipients of public-welfare payments participated in by the Federal Government; and

Whereas such inordinate secrecy proves a hindrance to the proper and just administration of the social-security laws; and

Whereas the inability to open such rolls of recipients to the proper law-enforcement authorities is conducive to fraud; and

Whereas the right to make public these names, when necessary, would likely save the State of Georgia many thousands of dollars per year: Be it therefore

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to repeal those laws which declare public-welfare rolls of a confidential nature; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be dispatched to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Members of the Georgia delegation in Congress.

Read and adopted February 7, 1951, in senate.

Read and adopted February 15, 1951, in house of representatives.

S. MARVIN GRIFFEN,
President of the Senate.

GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary of the Senate.

FRED HAND,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

J. W. BOONE,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

HON. WALTER HENDRIX,
Judge, Fulton Superior Court,
Atlanta, Ga.:

We, the grand jury for May-June 1951 term of Fulton Superior Court, hand you herewith the following special presentment:

We notice with pleasure that there is legislation pending in the national Congress which, if enacted into law, would permit States to pass legislation defining conditions under which relief rolls might be made public to grand juries, agencies of government and other properly interested parties without penalty from the National Government.

Not being familiar with the details of the pending legislation, we do not endorse this particular legislation but we do emphatically endorse the idea contained in the bill and urge that Georgia's representatives in the National Congress support such legislation.

We further instruct our secretary to send a copy of this special presentment to each of the Members of Congress from Georgia.

Respectfully submitted.

FULTON COUNTY GRAND JURY,

MAY-JUNE, 1951, TERM.

ARCHIBALD GANN, Foreman.

JULIAN S. FURSTENBURG,

Secretary.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of June 14, 1951]

OPEN THE WELFARE ROLLS

Senate passage yesterday of a law to allow States to open welfare rolls to public inspection without risking the loss of Federal

matching funds is in line with the growing public sentiment on this question.

Only this year the Georgia General Assembly passed a resolution asking Congress to strike out the law requiring welfare rolls to be kept secret. The reasoning of the legislature, and it undoubtedly is sound, was that chiselers would be kept off relief rolls if they knew they might be detected and brought to account.

As matters now stand, not even a grand jury or a legislative committee can examine relief rolls on the penalty of losing matching funds, which amount to about 70 percent of the total benefits distributed by the State.

The rapid growth of relief rolls in a period of great prosperity is becoming a matter of grave concern throughout the country. Georgia is not the only State which is chafing under the Federal regulation. Indiana was so incensed by the ease with which parasites can draw Government assistance, with no possible chance of detection, that they ignored the Federal regulation and passed a law providing for inspection of welfare rolls. Florida passed a similar law but with the condition that the cabinet would have authority to rescind its effect should Federal funds be withdrawn.

The Social Security Administration already has threatened to cut off Federal funds from Indiana, and it was this which prompted Representative JENNER, Indiana Republican, to offer the bill yesterday as a rider to the Labor-Federal Security appropriations bill. That Senators voted overwhelmingly to allow the rider to remain on the bill is an indication of prevailing sentiment.

Georgia is vitally interested in the final approval of the measure because it would give the State another weapon against overloading of the relief rolls by leeches while many actually needy persons are unable to obtain assistance.

We do not believe it necessary that the relief rolls be opened to inspection by every Tom, Dick, and Harry in order to accomplish the needed objective. But certainly grand juries and legislative committees ought to be allowed to determine whether relief money is being wisely spent and whether relief recipients are in genuine need of help.

The bill the Senate has passed simply provides that States which allow relief rolls to be inspected shall not be penalized. The States would be left free to determine the method and extent of inspection.

We hope the House of Representatives will concur and that the President will sign the measure. It is needed in Georgia and elsewhere.

**FULTON COUNTY
GRAND JURORS ASSOCIATION,
Atlanta, Ga.**

Whereas we, the Fulton County Grand Jurors Association, believe that the very survival of our democratic system of government depends upon a demonstrated ability to reduce governmental expense; and

Whereas we believe that a proper and safe reduction of governmental spending cannot be made unless the taxpayers know the purposes for, and the amounts in which, their money is being spent, so that the taxpayers can decide what activities should be dispensed with or curtailed; and

Whereas the welfare expenditures by city, county, State and Federal Government agencies represent one of the heaviest drains on the tax funds of this Nation, and should, therefore, be subject to the greatest public scrutiny; and

Whereas the present rules and regulations of the United States Public Welfare Administration make such proper public knowledge of the expenditure of tax funds impossible by prohibiting publication of the names of the recipients thereof, making violation of said rule a basis for the withholding of tax

funds from the duly constituted city, county, or State welfare distributing offices; and

Whereas the welfare funds, although distributed by and under the rules of a Federal agency, are nevertheless raised through the taxation of citizens within the sovereign States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State of Georgia delegation to the Congress of the United States be petitioned to press for the passage of legislation which will limit the power of the United States Public Welfare Administration to place restrictions on duly constituted welfare bodies within the several sovereign States in regard to the making known to the public the spending of public funds in whatever detail the several sovereign States regard as necessary to assure the absence of abuses and discrimination and to permit the public to decide the extent to which such welfare activities should be expanded or contracted, in the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

Attest:

EUGENE YOUNG,
Secretary.

DECATUR, GA., DE KALB COUNTY,
August 21, 1951.

HON. FRANK GUESS,
Judge of Superior Court,
De Kalb County, Ga.

We, the June term of the De Kalb County, Ga., grand jury, have made a study of relief as it is administered in our county and find it is being dispensed in accordance with State and Federal statutes. We are not at all critical of the De Kalb County Department nor its personnel, but we are concerned with the trend on a State and National level of this program. For instance, the disbursements in De Kalb County and the State of Georgia for the past several years are shown below:

	County	State of Georgia
Fiscal year ending—		
June 30, 1947.....	\$482,860.50	\$16,413,752.00
June 30, 1948.....	575,956.50	20,437,031.50
June 30, 1949.....	804,576.50	27,212,894.00

We understand that in De Kalb County the disbursements budgeted for 1950 exceed \$1,300,000.

The total of such disbursements in our county now exceeds the total taxes collected by the county, and we understand that on a percentage basis of those qualified under the statutes more are receiving relief in the State of Georgia than any other State in the Union except one. The funds come largely from the Federal and State governments, and of course, are obtained from taxes paid by our citizens. The consistent increase in this trend is shown in the above figures and we are concerned that in a period of high business activity and employment these figures are so large for certainly in a time of lower business volume the need would be much greater.

Our investigation leads us to believe that certain basic changes should be made in the Federal and State statutes and specifically we recommend that eligibility requirements for old-age assistance be tightened in order that available funds might provide more adequately for persons in actual need, and those in less need, relatively, be eliminated from the rolls. To this end we suggest that—

1. Investigation be made of the ability of adult sons and daughters to assist their parents, and in cases in which the income of children exceeds a certain amount, the parents be considered ineligible for public assistance.

We realize that in a few cases children would actually permit aged parents to suffer rather than assist them, and we recommend

provision be made for these exceptional cases.

2. The total income in the family group in which an old-age applicant or recipient is living be considered in determining his or her eligibility.

3. That recipients of public assistance who own property, give the State a lien on such property, through which the State would be repaid for aid given during the recipient's lifetime.

4. That publicity concerning public assistance, especially old-age assistance, through the press and radio, from State officials and candidates for office, give a clearer interpretation of public assistance as essential aid to the needy aged, rather than "a pension to which all over 65 years old are entitled." We feel that a great proportion of applicants and their children are sincerely convinced that old-age assistance is a pension program based almost entirely on age, rather than economic need.

In regard to the children's program—

1. State legislation which would continue aid to dependent children until a child's eighteenth birthday to children who are regularly enrolled in school. (Although Federal funds are available for this purpose, Georgia law requires that aid to a dependent child be discontinued on the child's sixteenth birthday. This frequently means that a child must drop out of school before completing his high school education.)

2. State and Federal financial assistance to local communities in providing foster home care for children whose own homes provide totally unsuitable environment. (Aid to dependent children is available only to children living in homes with blood relatives of specified degree.) Thus children who must be removed by the courts from their own families could be more adequately provided for than at present.

Our jury seriously doubts the advisability of dispensing relief through political channels.

Therefore, we respectfully request the clerk of the superior court of De Kalb County to furnish a photostat copy of this presentation to all the Members of our congressional delegation from Georgia, our two Senators, and our local De Kalb County delegation in the next session of the general assembly, including our State senator. We urgently request that this entire program be carefully considered by Congress and the next session of the State legislature and that the changes in the basic laws as suggested above, as well as others which no doubt will be developed from a study of the entire relief program be introduced and advocated in the Congress and in the next session of the general assembly of Georgia.

L. L. GREENSTED,
Foreman.

J. D. CHESNUT,
Secretary.

[From the Atlanta Journal of January 29, 1951]

DE KALB GRAND JURY'S FINDINGS ON RELIEF

In its special presentments regarding abuses of the public assistance program, sometimes referred to as "relief," the De Kalb County grand jury brings up a problem that should be of deep concern to Georgia and to the country at large.

"We feel," say the grand jurors, "that the old-age assistance rolls have been made a dumping ground for ungrateful children to get rid of responsibility for needy parents, or for children of means to shift to the public their own responsibility of providing for parents."

In fairness to cases of real need—and there are many such—as well as in justice to a tax-burdened public, this sort of imposture should be exposed and ended. Every payment of relief which is not based upon

honest necessity reduces by so much the aid that ought to go to those who without it would be truly destitute. Perhaps there are individuals and families who sincerely believe that old-age assistance is a pension to which all who are 65 or older are entitled automatically. Nothing could be further from the intent of the law.

Old-age assistance is entirely distinct from that phase of the social-security program known as old-age and survivors' insurance, or Federal old-age benefits. The latter, as we have pointed out in a previous discussion of the question, is financed in large part by a payroll tax to which employee and employer contribute equally; whereas the beneficiaries of old-age assistance have contributed nothing directly to the funds on which they depend. Yet, it is officially reported that at the end of the calendar year 1949 payments under old-age insurance were running at the annual rate of \$673,000,000, while public assistance payments had grown to the staggering sum of \$2,400,000,000. Furthermore, individuals in the public assistance group received, in many cases, much larger payments than those in the old-age and survivors' insurance group.

In Georgia public assistance payments have increased from \$16,413,752 in the fiscal year 1947 to more than \$33,000,000 in 1950—this in a period of full employment and abounding prosperity. For a year and a half they have been mounting at the rate of \$50,000 a month. The De Kalb grand jury notes that 600 out of every 1,000 persons in Georgia who are 65 or older are on relief, and expresses concern over political efforts to pack the relief rolls still further. Surely, such conditions call for sober thinking and remedial action.

The De Kalb grand jury began a study of this problem in its own county last summer and is continuing the investigation from term to term, not as a witch hunt but as a search for facts. It recommends that eligibility requirements for old-age assistance be tightened in order that available funds may provide more adequately for persons in actual need. It also urges legislative action to amend that part of the public assistance program which in effect puts a premium on illegitimate births. The resolute and constructive spirit in which the De Kalb grand jury is seeking to correct such abuses is a good example for the entire State.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HINSHAW, for today and tomorrow, on account of official business attending a conference of the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics.

Mr. COLE of New York, indefinitely, on account of official business.

Mr. HESS, for an indefinite time, on account of official business of the Armed Services Committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WICKERSHAM in six instances.

Mr. LANE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN and to include an article.

Mr. CRUMPACKER and to include a magazine article.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GEORGE and to include an editorial.

XCVII—768

Mr. ANGELL and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter in two instances.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in two instances and one to include a release of the War Department regarding the graves of Korean veterans, and in another instance to include an article from the National Tribune of this week's issue.

Mr. REED of New York in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORANO and to include a speech by Mr. PATTERSON, of Connecticut.

Mr. LECOMPTÉ and to include a set of resolutions of the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Oskaloosa, Iowa.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Texas) and to include an article.

Mr. WOODRUFF and to include certain resolutions.

Mr. HOPE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HART and to include an address by Hon. John P. Taylor, retiring Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a newspaper article written by Mr. Gill Robb Wilson.

Mr. RICHARDS and to include a radio address by Hon. Hugh G. Grant, former Ambassador to Albania.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan and to include an editorial.

Mr. GARY and to include an address by the Lord Mayor of London delivered at Williamsburg, Va.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1786. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and catastrophes of nature; and

S. 2006. An act to increase the lending authority of Export-Import Bank of Washington and to extend the period within which the bank may make loans.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 27, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 333. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1054). Referred to

the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1638. A bill to facilitate the management of the National Park System and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 414. Resolution to establish a committee of the House to investigate and study duplication and overlapping of taxes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1056). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 439. Resolution for consideration of S. 1335, an act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; without amendment (Rept. No. 1057). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 440. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5411, a bill to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1058). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 438. Resolution for the relief of C. E. Heaney; without amendment (Rept. No. 1059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3666. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1713. An act for the relief of Charles Cooper; without amendment (Rept. No. 1062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3428. A bill for the relief of Mitsuo Arita; with amendment (Rept. No. 1060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEWART:

H. R. 5489. A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Malta irrigation district and the Glasgow irrigation district, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5490. A bill relating to the compensation of certain employees of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5491. A bill to provide for national recognition of Adelaide Johnson, the sculptor of "The Woman's Monument," and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5492. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to eliminate the income limitations imposed upon the payment of non-service-connected pensions to veterans

of World War I who have reached the age of 70 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 5493. A bill to provide an additional method for computing certain benefits payable under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to persons who continue their employment after sustaining injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5494. A bill to authorize the reinstatement or issuance of national service life insurance covering the lives of certain individuals notwithstanding the provisions of the Insurance Act of 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 334. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to take the necessary steps to continue the maintenance of a post office in the North End district of the city of Boston; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to take the necessary steps to continue the maintenance of a post office in the North End district of the city of Boston; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of General Court of Massachusetts to take the necessary steps to continue the maintenance of a post office in the North End district of the city of Boston; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States, relative to taking the necessary steps to continue the maintenance of a post office in the North End district of the city of Boston; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5495. A bill for the relief of Fedele Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 5496. A bill for the relief of F. Archie Meatyard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 5497. A bill for the relief of Helga G. Jordan and her son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5498. A bill for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 5499. A bill for the relief of Tamaki Sakasai Cordova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 5500. A bill for the relief of Herman E. Mosley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5501. A bill for the relief of John R. Keane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

439. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Grand Lodge of the State of New Jersey, Order of Sons of Italy in America, urging the President and the Senate to bring about a revision of the peace treaty with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

440. Also, resolution adopted at a mass meeting of the Central of Polish Organizations at the Polish Peoples Home, Passaic, N. J., pledging every effort for the liberation of the Polish Nation from the bonds of communistic control and to correct the shameful agreements of Yalta and Tehran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

441. By Mr. HALE: Petition of Aerie No. 1248 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Rumford Falls, Maine, urging the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in their efforts to secure the freedom of William N. Oatis, by honorable means, and offering support and vitality of its membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world, and urging the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet news agency, Tass, as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences where vital information may be revealed, until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

442. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Antonio Fernós-Isern, president, the Constitutional Convention, San Juan, P. R., relative to expressing to the United States its sentiments of respect and its gratitude for the adoption of Public Law 600 of 1950; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday,
September 19, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our need is the altar of our prayer. The panoply of Thy love is the sanctuary of our devotion. Thou hast called us whose lives pass swiftly, as a watch in the night, to labor with Thee in the unfolding purpose of the ages. Since it is of Thy mercy that this another day is added to our mortal lives, sanctify our work; let no unhallowed words pollute the tongues which Thou hast made to praise and bless Thee. May the meditations of our minds and hearts be acceptable in Thy sight. So distill upon us the dews of Thy quietness and Thy calm that in simple trust and deeper reverence we may be found steadfast and abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that in Him and for Him and with Him our labor is not in vain. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 26, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On September 25, 1951:

S. 1074. An act to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the Post Office Department.

On September 26, 1951:

S. 24. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," approved June 26, 1930, as amended;

S. 462. An act for the relief of Rosita Anita Navarro and Ramona Alicia Navarro;

S. 495. An act for the relief of Richard J. Walling; and

S. 665. An act for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor.

On September 27, 1951:

S. 83. An act for the relief of First Lt. James E. Willcox;

S. 295. An act for the relief of Michail Ioannou Bourbakis;

S. 427. An act for the relief of Nene Baalstad;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Polly Anne Caldwell;

S. 810. An act for the relief of Howard I. Smith;

S. 880. An act for the relief of Ann Lampugh;

S. 906. An act for the relief of Marie Kristine Hansen; and

S. 1279. An act for the relief of Davis Min Lee.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1623. An act to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 333. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. STENNIS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.